Weekly Compilation of

Presidential Documents

Monday, July 3, 1995
Volume 31—Number 26
Pages 1113–1179

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

Arkansas
America's Hope, Arkansas' Pride luncheon in Little Rock—1113
Mahlon Martin Apartments in Little Rock—1128
California, 50th anniversary of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco—1131
Community policing grants—1157
Cuban-American community—1137
Democratic National Committee fundraiser—1150
Illinois
Abraham Lincoln Courage Award in Chicago—1171
Fundraiser in Chicago—1163
Japan-U.S. trade agreement—1147
Oregon
Pacific Rim Economic Conference in Portland—1139, 1143
Portland State University in Portland—1144
Radio address—1122

Appointments and Nominations

Defense Department, Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman, statement—1176

Communications to Congress

Budget plan, letter—1149
Corporation for Public Broadcasting, message transmitting report—1150
Cyprus, letter transmitting report—1136
District of Columbia budget legislation, message transmitting—1163

Communications to Congress—Continued

Emergency salvage timber sale legislation, letter—1170
Mongolia, message transmitting investment treaty—1137
Russia, message transmitting report on MFN trade status—1176
"Saving Law Enforcement Officers' Lives Act of 1995," message transmitting—1175
Ukraine, message transmitting taxation convention documents—1150

Communications to Federal Agencies

Combined Federal Campaign, memorandum—1148
Haiti, memorandum on assistance—1131
Jordan, memorandum—1121
Upgrading security at Federal facilities, memorandum—1148

Executive Orders

Further Amendment to Executive Order No. 12852 (President's Council on Sustainable Development)—1146

Interviews With the News Media

Exchange with reporters in San Francisco, CA—1135
Interviews
Gary Matthews of ESPN in Pine Bluff, AR—1127
Susan Yoachum of the San Francisco Chronicle in Pine Bluff, AR—1123

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

Editor's Note: The President was in Miami, FL, on June 30, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

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

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

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

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

Contents—Continued

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

United Nations, Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali—1131, 1135

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations
Budget rescissions legislation, agreement with Congress—1162
Deaths
Jonas Salk—1121
Warren Burger—1130
Egypt, attempted assassination of President Mubarak—1136

Statements by the President—Continued

Independence Day—1161
Supreme Court decisions
Georgia congressional redistricting case—1162
Student athlete drug testing case—1136

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—1179
Checklist of White House press releases—1179
Digest of other White House announcements—1176
Nominations submitted to the Senate—1177

Remarks at the America's Hope, Arkansas' Pride Luncheon in Little Rock, Arkansas

June 23, 1995

Thank you so much. Thank you for being here. Thank you for being in such a good frame of mind. And thank you for making Hillary and Al and Tipper and me feel so wonderful today.

You know, I've always kind of resented Al Gore for being a little smarter than I am and knowing a little more about various things. And now he's gotten funnier than I am. I really—[*laughter*].

I thank you, Maurice Mitchell and Skip Rutherford and Jay Dunn and Doug Hatterman and all the others who worked. I have to mention one person I know is not here and another person I have not yet seen. I know a lot of people worked hard on this, but I know that my longtime friend Merle Peterson, who's away, and Jimmy Red Jones sat in a room and called a lot of you and harassed you until you bought tickets to this. [*Laughter*] And I want to thank them and all the rest of the committee for the work that they did.

I would like to thank Mack McLarty and all those from Arkansas who work in the administration, as well as those who work here in the Arkansas office who've tried to give you a lifeline through the fog that Washington can become. I thank them for representing me. I want to say a special word of thanks to Mack for all the many things he's done over the last 2½ years. I got a vivid picture of one of them yesterday when we were in New Jersey at a Ford plant, which, doubtless, had made various vehicles that the McLarty dealerships had sold over the years. But I couldn't help thinking, you know, Mack has basically become the country's point person in all of our developing economic and political relationships with Latin America, which have expanded by more in the last 2½ years than in any previous point in history. And this Ford plant in New Jersey was making trucks being sold in Latin America. And I never realized it before, but there was McLarty always thinking about what it's going to be like 20 years from now when he's running all those Ford dealerships again. [*Laughter*] You can be very proud of the leadership he has given to our country, and I thank him for his long friendship. And Bruce Lindsey, Marsha Scott, all the other people from Arkansas, and the people who run this office, they have enabled me to try and stay in touch with you in times when it has not always been easy. And Carol Rasco is not here; she's getting ready for our economic conference in the Pacific Northwest. But I see some people here particularly involved in health care and social services I know call her. I thank them for the work they've done to make it possible for us to try to stay in touch with one another.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to Congresswoman Blanche Lambert Lincoln and Congressman Ray Thornton. And congratulations, Congressmen, to you and to our Senators and to our Governor on Red River. Nice work. Truman Arnold is very happy he can keep working for the—[*applause*]—Truman Arnold woke up this morning thinking he could keep working for our reelection and for our party now.

We wish you well, Congressman Thornton. I wish you weren't retiring, but whatever you decide to do, I imagine you will make a good show of it. You always have. And you've really served our State well, and you've served our Nation well, and we thank you for that.

I want to say, as Hillary did, a special word of thanks to Senator Bumpers and Senator Pryor. They have fulfilled a lot of roles that maybe on some occasions they would rather not have done in the last 2½ years. And we've had some rough spots in the road. We've had some ups and downs, but they have always, always, always been there. And

in very personal ways that will probably never become fully known or appreciated, I can tell you that I am profoundly grateful to both of them.

I saw Dale on television the other night speaking to the Small Business Conference, talking about the importance of balancing the budget and doing it in a humane way and the right way. And a lot of those Republicans were really listening to him in ways that only he can communicate. I think of all the times when David has taken the floor of the Senate to try to restore just a little bit of humanity and sanity to a national political debate that has gotten way too out of hand too often in the last 2 years, and I thank him for that.

And let me also say I am especially glad to see Governor and Mrs. Tucker here today and especially grateful for the reception you gave them. As an Arkansan, I felt exactly the same way. And thank you, Governor, for being here. We're proud of you. Thank you.

I might also note that the last time I checked, the unemployment rate in Arkansas is down to 4.1 percent, which is—after what we suffered all those years, that's another reason to rejoice.

You know, I was listening to the Vice President go through that whole litany, and I have to say I'm also especially indebted to the people who have spoken here before me, to Tipper for all the work she's done in mental health and for the courageous and sometimes lonely battles she always wages within the administration to remind all of us that that's a very important part of health care, and to Tipper and to Hillary for the work they've done to try to make sure we increase our emphasis on women's health concerns.

And I was very proud of Hillary yesterday in particular. She took me along, and I spoke to a remarkable event in front of the Arlington Cemetery yesterday where we broke ground, long overdue, on America's first memorial for the 1.8 million women who have worn the uniform of our country in military service. One of the things that I am quite proud of that almost nobody knows—there are a lot of achievements of this administration that fall into that category—one of the things that I'm very proud of that almost nobody knows, that I think is part of the enduring influence of my wife and my wonderful departed mother, is that in the last 2½ years we have opened up to women in the services 260,000 positions previously denied them in the service of their country. And I'm very proud of it, and the military is very proud of it.

I said that last comment, and the Vice President was up here giving our record and it reminded me about a week ago, maybe 2 weeks ago now, we had an event at the Treasury Department. And we were announcing one of our continuing Al Gore genius moves to reinvent the Government and make it easier to deal with. And this one had to do with the fact that next year, in 32 States, people can file their taxes, State and Federal together, electronically, no paper, no hassle, file them both together. We'll distribute it, we'll do all the work. And we always try to have a real person like one of you at one of these announcements to explain how this will actually change people's lives.

So, it was just before the Small Business Conference started, and we got this John Deere dealer from west Texas come who happened to be a supporter of mine, probably the only person in the whole county—[*laughter*]—there he was. But anyway, he ran a good-sized John Deere dealership, and he got up there and he said—I got so tickled—he said—he brought all the paper that he'd been using on his taxes and he said, "I can throw all this away, and it's great." And he explained how much money he was going to save, but he said, "You know," he said, "you fellows have been doing a great job of reinventing Government. What you need to do is reinvent communication because it ain't getting out to the rednecks that I sell John Deeres to." [*Laughter*]

You know, some nights I watch the news and I feel like that old country song, "They Changed Everything About Me But My Name." [*Laughter*] That's beginning to change as well. I want to have—for just a moment I want to have a serious conversation. The Vice President has outlined a great deal of what we have done—and I use the word "we" in the largest sense. One of them, our proudest achievements, has very little to do with me except that I made it possible, and I think the history books will reflect that Al Gore was the most influential and effec-

tive Vice President of the United States in the history of our Republic through the 21st century.

We were at the Small Business Conference the other day; we hauled out 16,000 Federal regulations that we were getting rid of because of the reinventing Government task force: cutting half the regulations of the Small Business Administration, 40 percent of the regulations of the Department of Education, dramatically changing the way the Occupational Safety and Health Administration is going to work, reducing the paperwork burdens of the Environmental Protection Agency by 25 percent, setting up a hotline so that if a small business person calls the EPA now, that person cannot be fined if he or she is calling for help to try to figure out how to solve a problem.

These are important changes in the way our Government relates to people. But I have to tell you that what is going on in America today is more than just whether this administration is achieving things that are or are not known about. This is a period of deep and profound change in the whole world and in this country, the way we work, the way we live, the conditions in which we raise our children, the opportunities available to us, and the challenges confronting us. They're different. And all of us are the product of our own experiences. I tell everybody that works at the White House all the time, especially young people who see things they don't understand, I keep telling everybody we all see the world through the prism of our own experience. Even our imaginations are limited by what we have known and felt and seen.

And yet, all these things are happening around us, some utterly wonderful and some utterly horrible that go beyond our ability even to imagine a resolution of. A lot of good things, the end of the cold war, the growth of the information age, the fact that a kid in the most remote mountain school in Arkansas can now hook into an Internet which will pull information out of a library in Australia, just for example, now, these are wonderful things. And we see all these things, and it's just staggering it's so wonderful. We see a lot of our old problems appear to be getting better. The crime rate as a whole is dropping in almost every major city in America. That's the good news. And I could give you 50 other examples of good news. We had the biggest expansion of trade opportunities in our country in the last 2 years that we have had in a generation, maybe ever.

But underneath that, it seems that every opportunity has within it the possibility of something new going wrong. Crime rate goes down, but the arbitrary rate of violence among teenagers goes up, giving us chilling feelings about what the crime rate might be like in 10 or 15 years. And more and more and more young kids are just being kind of left alone out there to raise themselves, struggling to figure out what to do, stuck in home environments, community environments, and school environments that aren't likely to help them to turn around the challenges they face.

All this wonderful technology and this easily accessible information has its dark underside. You can get on the Internet now and tap into one of these fanatic extremists, and they will explain to you how you, too, can make a bomb just like the one that blew up the Federal building in Oklahoma City. The explosion of technology means that a radical religious group in Japan can figure out how to get a little bitty vial of gas and walk into a subway and break it open and kill a bunch of totally innocent people and put hundreds of others in the hospital.

So you see the point I'm trying to make: There is so much good in the world, so much new possibility, but the Scripture tells us that the darkness that is in the human soul will be with us until the end of time, and those dark forces are finding new expressions as well. And we're all sitting around here trying to figure out how to make sense of this and what to do, so that what is really going on in Washington, which is confusing to people, is not much different than what's going on inside a lot of people's heads, which is confusing to people. And it's because it is really new.

I am proud of the fact that this administration negotiated agreements, which means that there are no nuclear weapons pointed at the children of Arkansas since the dawn of the nuclear age. I'm proud of that. But the paradox is—let me just give you the para-

dox—the paradox is a year or so ago, Hillary and I went to Riga, Latvia, to celebrate the withdrawal of Russian troops there for the first time since before World War II, tens of thousands of people in the street weeping with joy, loving America. A poll just came out and said that Bill Clinton was the most popular politician in Latvia. I'm trying to figure out how to get on the ballot there, give them some electoral votes. [*Laughter*]

But then we go into—it was a wonderful survey. It wasn't me; I was America. It didn't have anything to do with me; I was the United States. But then we go behind closed doors into a meeting and the first thing they ask me for is an FBI office. Why? Because when you rip away the iron hand of communism and you take out the Russian army—there is this huge port, the largest city in Northern Europe that most people couldn't even find on a map here, that they're now terrified will become a great transit point for drug trafficking and organized crime of all kinds. The most popular thing we've done in Russia in the last year is not dismantling the nuclear weapons, it's opening an FBI office in Moscow. Why? Because they got rid of communism, and they didn't have things like the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Securities and Exchange Commission, so within no time at all, half of their financial institutions were controlled by organized crime.

I say this to make a point. We have to go back deep inside now to our basic values and our basic institutions. And the debates we are having in Washington now are over fundamental things that we used to take for granted.

When I was Governor here, in all the years until the last year when I ran for President, we only had an unemployment rate below the national average one month, one month. A lot of my legislators are out there. They remember how we struggled with that, but we had a consensus. We disagreed on the details, and we fought at election time, but there was a general consensus that if we made our State more attractive economically and that if we continued to invest in the skills of our people, that in the end that strategy would be rewarded. And it might take a decade to turn it around, but it would be rewarded.

And I'm convinced that everybody in this room, in addition to the great leadership we have in our State today, played a role in the fact that we have an unemployment rate below the national average today. It did not happen overnight. It's all of you who are entrepreneurs, all of you who built your own companies, all of you who came in here and invested in our State from beyond our State's borders, sometimes from beyond our Nation's borders. It happened—being driven in a direction.

But we basically accepted fundamental assumptions. A lot of that is out the window now. And I want you to try to understand what we're going through and why sometimes it doesn't seem to make sense when you see it over the airwaves. We are debating now really first principles in Washington. For example, there's a significant number of people in Congress who believe all of our problems are personal and cultural in nature, and if everybody would just wake up tomorrow and behave themselves, we wouldn't have any problems, and therefore, we don't need the Government to do anything, whatever the Government does will only make it worse. And if we just give you the money back, everything would be fine, because all of our problems are personal and cultural.

Now, at a certain level that is true, isn't it? I mean, no matter what we do with the government in Arkansas or Washington, if people won't behave themselves and do right and make the most of their own lives, nobody can do that for you. That's something you have to do for yourselves. At some point, no matter how much adversity people face, some people make it, and some don't. And it's their responsibility.

On the other hand, if you play the odds, you know that really successful communities, States, and nations do the best they can to make sure that everybody has the best chance to make the most of their own lives. I don't see it that way. I don't think that it's either—that it's an either/or thing, that all of our problems are personal or cultural on the one hand or political or economic on the other. I think the answer is both. But because things are changing and people are confused,

the extreme sides of the debate are really being argued out all over again, just as they were literally decades ago to the beginning of this century when the excesses of the industrial revolution were being felt.

Let me give you another example leading from that. A debate—we never had that debate in Arkansas. We never saw any inconsistency between fighting teenage pregnancy on the one hand and trying to get more responsibility and investing more money in preschool education on the other. The idea was both, right?

Give you another example—a lot of people feel flowing from the first debate that since the Government only messes things up, the fundamental responsibility of the Government is to maintain national defense, cut taxes, and balance the budget as quickly as possible without regard to the other consequences of what's being done. They honestly believe this. This is not a—I'm being, I think, fair and accurate.

Then there are others who feel that the budget deficit is a terrible thing but not the only deficit the country has; and that if we don't educate our kids and if we don't at least take care of our fundamental obligations to the elderly people on Medicare who don't have enough money to live on as it is, that the country will come apart at the seams more; and that we have certain common responsibilities. And some people think that if we never balance the budget, it's better to keep investing that money.

But I don't see it that way. I think that we ought to balance the budget, because we never had a permanent deficit before 12 years ago—I mean, 12 years before I took office—we haven't had a balanced budget since '69. But in the seventies, all of you will remember we had all that stagflation. Oil prices were going crazy, and the reasons for the deficits were largely localized and—we never had a built-in deficit every year, year-in and year-out, in this country's history until 1981. And we've taken it down by a trillion dollars over a 7-year period since I've been in office.

We ought to balance the budget. Next year—we'll be seeing more money on interest on the debt next year than we will spend on national defense. The budget would be balanced this year, right now, because of the cuts we've already made, were it not for the interest we have to pay just in the 12 years before I showed up up there. That's how big a problem it is. It erodes our competitive position in world markets. It drives our incomes down. And it undermines our ability to borrow to invest in the future.

You know, there's a difference between borrowing money to build a business or buy a house and borrowing money to go out to eat tonight. There's a big difference. And we've got it all mixed up. You can't tell what we're doing now. So we need to do that.

But we also have to realize—I think that we do have more than one deficit. And at the end—in this information age and this global economy, for us to be cutting education is like cutting defense at the height of the cold war. I don't think it makes any sense.

But there is this ideological debate over—and the third big debate, maybe the most important one of all, is the one that—there are people who honestly believe that if you think all of our problems are personal and cultural and moral, if you believe the Government can't do anything right but mess up a one-car parade, the only thing it's supposed to do is national defense, cut taxes, and balance the budget, then a lot of the same people believe that anyone who disagrees with them are intrinsically a threat to the Republic and anything you do to beat them or put them in a bad light is all right, so that the politics of demonization, the meanness quotient of our politics, the distortion level of it has increased quite a bit in recent years.

Now, I think it's good to fight and argue, but I think we're around here after way over 200 years because, no matter how the arguments came out, we kept this thing going in the middle of the road and going forward, not too far left, not too far right, but always forward. And that's why we're still around.

But I'm just telling you these are fundamental debates that are going on so that it's no longer the kind of normal debate you see in Washington. Instead of the range of difference being like this, it's more like this now. And it's because of all these changes that are going on in the country and in the world.

Let me just give you some specific examples because I think it's a phony debate. I think we need to worry about going forward, now how far we can get out on these extremes. I think we need to return to our basic values. You know, go back and read the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence. We got together as a Nation because we thought it was self-evident that all people were endowed by God with certain inalienable rights, among them life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and that it was necessary to form governments to pursue these ends.

And our Constitution was created with the flexibility to enable us to change to meet the challenges of new times and with the ironclad guarantees of the Bill of Rights that there were limits beyond which Government could not go in infringing upon the freedoms of individuals. And all of our debates, if we'll get back to those basic things and the facts, will lead us to a practical solution that will push us ahead. But I'll just give you some examples.

The family leave law: There were people who were ideologically opposed to the family leave law because they said Government shouldn't tell business anything. But the truth is that most parents are also workers today. Whether you think it's a good idea or a bad idea, whether it's a single-parent household or a two-parent household, most parents are also workers. If you believe that the family is the most important institution in our society, on the one hand, and you also believe that if we're not competitive globally, on the other, we're in deep trouble, then this country has no more important objective than enabling people to not have to make a false choice. We must enable people to be successful parents and successful workers. That's why I was for the family leave law.

But not everybody feels this way. That's big debate up there. And when you hear this rhetoric you have to understand that. There are a lot of people—there are honest people who honestly believe that it was a wrong thing to do.

It sure didn't hurt the economy. We've had 6.7 million new jobs since it passed, record numbers of new business formations in 1993 and 1994. So all those predictions that it was going to hurt the economy or be burdensome were wrong. It's an ideological debate.

Second, the environment: Most people, I believe, here think that we have to be able to grow the economy in a way that preserves the environment so our grandchildren and our grandchildren's grandchildren will still have Arkansas to live in. And a big part of what we define of Arkansas is that. And most of the time when we fought about the environment when we were—when I was Governor, we fought over how to achieve that goal and whether the Government was going too far, the regulations should be done in a certain way or another way. But we were fighting over how to achieve that goal.

That is not the debate up there anymore. The debate is far more fundamental. There are people who believe, "Well, it's a nice thing to preserve the environment, but in the end nobody will ever really let it go down the tubes. And the Government will mess it up. Get the Government out of it. And if the environment is abused in the short run, so what. Somehow the planet will regenerate itself."

Let me tell you—a committee of Congress just the other day voted to eliminate all controls on offshore oil drilling in the United States, all of them, everywhere, without regard to any evidence of how much oil is there or whether it's worth the risk or whether there's any evidence of safe drilling or what the differences in the areas are or what would happen to tourism or what would happen to retirement or what would happen to anything. Why? Because they're ideologically opposed to the Government having any kind of partnership at all with the private sector on this.

And that's just one example. But I'm telling you, folks, it is an economic as well as an environmental issue. We're on our way to Portland, Oregon, the Vice President and I are, when we leave you. And we're dealing with a terrible set of problems up there, where a lot of the timber people want to cut more timber in the forest, and because the waters have been more polluted they're losing the salmon. And that's just one example.

I believe we've got to find a way to do both. Our State has used the Nature Conservancy more than any State in the country,

I think, to buy land to set aside, because, as Will Rogers said, ''They ain't making no more of it.'' And the people who supported it were the business people in our State. This is a fundamental debate.

I'll give you a third example: Dr. Foster. Al Gore alluded to him. Dr. Foster. There are people in Washington, and they were—they had enough influence to keep his nomination from coming to a vote—who believe that he is unfit for any public office ever because he performed a few legal abortions, and therefore, he should never be considered for any public service and if the people who wanted to be President in the other party knew what was good for them, they would vote no. And since we had enough votes to confirm him, they could not even let him come to a vote.

Now, here's a guy, unlike the rest of—most of the rest of us—who's actually done something to try to reduce teen pregnancy, to try to reduce the number of abortions, and to try to tell kids on a consistent, disciplined way, who don't have other role models to tell them, that they should not have sex before they're married. Here's a guy who's actually gone out and organized a program that was recognized not by me but by my predecessor, President Bush, in an organized, disciplined fashion to tell young people, ''I don't care what kind of problems you've got, I don't care what your peer pressures are. I don't care what you're going through. You have no business having sex. You cannot promote teen pregnancy, and you ought not to do it to your life. You ought to stay off drugs, stay in school, and do a good job with your life.'' Here's a guy who's ridden country dusty roads in Alabama and brought health care to people that they never could have gotten otherwise. Here's a man who's delivered thousands of babies, and had at least one of his former patients stand up and publicly say, ''I was going to have an abortion, and he talked me out of it. He talked me out of it.''

In other words, here's a guy who has actually lived what other folks say they believe in. But in this sort of new world that's taken hold up here, he wasn't politically correct and pure enough to serve as Surgeon General, even though he had actually done the things they say they wish to do. This is a profound debate. And so they were even willing to abuse the filibuster process.

Clarence Thomas could have been kept off the Supreme Court if the Democrats had said, ''Well, we don't have enough votes to beat him, but we sure got enough votes to keep him from coming to a vote.'' But they said, ''No, that would be morally wrong. The President has a right to make an appointment. The committee has a right to make the recommendation. And the Senate ought to vote.'' But not in this new world. In this new world that are no rules except winning and losing, because one side is all good, and the other side is all bad. If we had had that attitude for the last 219 years, we wouldn't be here today. We wouldn't be here today.

So what is to become of us as a people? I ran for this job because I wanted to do two things, two big things: I wanted to restore the American dream. I wanted to get the economy going. I wanted to lift stagnant wages and get the jobs coming back into the economy and fix the education system so people could actually get out of this awful two-decade slump we've been in where even when the economic numbers get better, nobody ever gets a raise. But I also wanted to bring the country together.

Now, the second issue is even more important than the first. And it can be a very good thing that we are having these big debates over fundamental questions. But I want you to understand just how deep and fundamental these debates are.

If you look at the budget debate here, I applaud the Republicans for being for a balanced budget, and I hope all the Democrats will be, for the reasons I just explained. It is not right for our country to have a permanent deficit. I wasn't for the amendment because we ought to have the right to borrow when we need to. But we shouldn't be in a system of permanent deficits.

But my budget reflects what I just talked to you about. My budget reflects the idea that we need to keep going forward. So I believe that I'm right. I think we should balance the budget but increase our investment in education. I think we have to cut the rate at which we're increasing health expenditures but not so much that we're going to close down rural hospitals or urban hospitals

and not so much that we're going to burden elderly people who don't have enough to live on as it is and can't afford to pay a whole lot more for their health care and shouldn't be asked to give up health care. I believe that we ought to cut spending on welfare but not so much that we don't invest in child care and basic training so we can actually move people from welfare to work instead of just throwing poor kids in the street. The objective of welfare reform should be to help people, again, become good workers and good parents, not just to save money.

I believe any tax cut we have should be so small it doesn't require us to cut these other things and should be focused on the people who need it to help them raise their kids and educate them. That's why I proposed a tax deduction for the cost of education after high school. I think that's important.

And I know if you cut the tax cut back and focus it on education and child rearing and take 10 years instead of 7 to balance the budget, then you don't have to cut education, and you don't have to imperil Medicare and Medicaid and you don't have to go from a welfare reform plan that should be tough on work but good to children to one that doesn't have any work and sticks it to kids. It moves us ahead. But it's not an ideologically extreme position. It says we have two things we want to do: balance the budget and bring our country together and raise incomes and move forward. And we can do them both. And that's what's going on up there now. These are big, fundamental questions.

I just want to say, in closing, that a lot of what's happened to you here, a lot of the outrageous, outrageous things that have been said about our State and a lot of the lickin' that you've taken is a product of the confusion and the disorientation of the times and the idea that there are no rules and people just sort of flailing around trying to win another one to get to tomorrow. That is not what made this country great. That is not what made this country great, and it's not what you taught me to do here.

And I just want you to know, the greatest thing that ever happens to me is when I get to be all of you. Hillary and I were in Ukraine for the 50th anniversary of the end of World War II. And I gave a speech at the university there, and there were, I don't know, 60,000 people or something in the streets. And then everywhere we drove, they were four or five deep waving American flags. And I met all these old veterans from World War II who fought with the Americans then, telling me everything they did and showing me all their medals, you know. They weren't waving at me, they were waving at America. They were waving at America.

You know, everything the Vice President said—I'm glad I have a chance to play a major role in what we're doing in the Middle East and what we're doing in Northern Ireland and what's happening in Haiti and the deneutralization of the world—I'm glad about all that. But the only reason I had that chance is because for a little while in our country's history I get to become all of us, the United States. And I am telling you I've been there.

There is no country in the world as well positioned as we are for the next century. There is no country—[*applause*]—because we do have a limited Government that allows the private sector to flourish and entrepreneurs to do well, but we have enough ability to work together to solve common problems that we can do that. We have the potential for the right balance and the right flexibility.

There is no country that is any better positioned because of our terrific geographic and economic and racial, ethnic and religious diversity. But unless we learn to how to recover both the sense of personal responsibility and a sense of appreciation for people who are different from us, unless we learn how to resolve our differences without demonizing people and how to look toward the long run, we could squander the most colossal opportunity our country has ever had.

Because of the way technology works in the 21st century, Arkansas can not only have a lower unemployment rate than the rest of the country, our people can actually enjoy a standard of living equal to that of any people in the world. And that can happen everywhere. But it depends upon whether we can go back to these first principles and go forward with a sense of balance and mutual respect.

At the end of the Civil War, Abraham Lincoln said, "We cannot be enemies. We must be friends." That is what I say to you. And when you get angry about things you think are happening and when things happen you don't understand, just remember, this is still the greatest country in the world. It is still the greatest country in the world.

Stand up and fight for what you believe in. But fight against people who want to throw this country way off the track. And fight for the idea that we can pull together. After that Oklahoma City bombing, America was shaken to its very core. But it threw some of the meanness out of all of us. And it made all of us reexamine where we are. And our sort of heart and our common sense were reasserted. After that wonderful young Air Force Captain Scott O'Grady survived 6 hideous days in Bosnia and was rescued by a brilliant American operation, we were all exhilarated, and that put some of the energy back in all of us.

What I want you to know is to get to tomorrow, we have to have the heart and the openness to other people that we found in the tragedy of Oklahoma City and the self-confidence and energy that we had when that boy came home. And if we do that, we're going to be just fine.

That is the issue in 1996. That is what you're investing in. It's my last election. I'll never run for anything else. [*Laughter*] You'll never have to come to one of these again. You'll never be dunned again. [*Laughter*] You'll never have to stand in line again if you don't want to. But just know this time, this time, the stakes are the highest they have ever been, higher than they were in '92 because of where we have moved and where we can go. It is worth the fight. And I can't make it without you, but together I think we will.

God bless you, and thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:35 p.m. in the William J. Clinton Ballroom at the Excelsior Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Maurice Mitchell, legal counsel, Arkansas Democratic Party; luncheon organizers James L. "Skip" Rutherford, Jay Dunn, Doug Hatterman, Merle Peterson, and Jimmy Red Jones; and Gov. Jim Guy Tucker of Arkansas and his wife, Betty. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on the Death of Jonas Salk

June 23, 1995

Hillary and I want to extend our deepest sympathies to the family and friends of Dr. Jonas Salk, a man whose indefatigable pursuit of solutions made this world a better place to live. The victory of this medical pioneer over a dreaded disease continues to touch many, from the students who study his work to the countless individuals whose lives have been saved by his efforts. His polio vaccine opened the door to a society in which good health was taken for granted. And, over the last decade, his efforts to find a cure for AIDS gave us all hope. He was a true leader, and we will miss him greatly.

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

Memorandum on Jordan

June 23, 1995

Presidential Determination No. 95–27

Memorandum for the Secretary of State

Subject: Certification of Jordan Under Section 130(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985

Pursuant to section 130(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985 (Public Law 99–83), I hereby certify that Jordan is publicly committed to the recognition of Israel and to negotiate promptly and directly with Israel under basic tenets of United Nations Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

You are authorized and directed to report this certification, together with the attached justification, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. You are further authorized and directed to publish this determination, together with the attached justification, in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

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

The President's Radio Address

June 24, 1995

Good morning. Today I'm talking to you from the Convention Center in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. The Arkansas firefighters are meeting here, and I'm the first sitting President ever to visit Pine Bluff. Zachary Taylor planned to come in 1849, but he had to cancel. It's a record I'm proud to set. I'm also proud to be here with Dr. Henry Foster, who was born here and grew up here.

Just under 5 months ago, I nominated this fine man to be our Surgeon General. And this week, a majority of the United States Senate was clearly prepared to confirm him as Surgeon General. But he wasn't confirmed. He wasn't confirmed because the Senate was never even allowed to vote on his confirmation, because they were blocked by a group, a minority group, of willful Senators who abused the procedure to keep his nomination from coming to a vote for their own political ends.

Let me tell you a little bit about Dr. Foster. He's been a doctor for 38 years, including 3 years in the United States Air Force. He has delivered thousands of babies and trained hundreds of young doctors. He's ridden dusty country roads in Alabama to bring health care to people who never would have gotten it otherwise. He has labored to reduce teen pregnancy, to reduce the number of abortions, to tell young people without other role models, in a disciplined, organized way: you shouldn't have sex before you're married; you should stay off drugs; you should stay in school and do a good job with your life. His efforts to give a future to young people without one were recognized first not by me but by my Republican predecessor, President Bush.

Let me tell you something: If more people in America lived their lives like Henry Foster, there would be fewer kids on drugs, fewer teen pregnancies, fewer abortions, fewer broken families. This is a man our country should be proud to call our own.

So why was a group of Senators determined to stop Dr. Foster? A minority of the Senate blocked a vote on him in a calculated move to showcase their desire to take away a woman's right to choose. Dr. Foster has faithfully performed his duties as a doctor for 38 years. Although he has delivered thousands of babies, when the law permitted it, the patient requested it, and after appropriate counseling, he did perform an average of about one abortion per year.

Now, I know it is easy to condemn abortion. It's easy to put on divisive television ads or pass out inflammatory materials. But it is very hard to actually work with children and look at them face to face, kids that nobody pays any attention to, and look at them and tell them they ought not to have sex, they ought not to get pregnant, they ought not to do drugs. That's hard. That's why most of us don't do it. But Henry Foster did.

Unfortunately, in Washington today, pure political correctness and raw political power count a whole lot more than actually doing something to reduce the tragedies of teen pregnancy and the high number of abortions.

You know, I believe it is clear what the law of the land is, and I believe that abortion should be rare but it should be legal and safe. The extreme right wing in our country wants to impose its views on all the rest of Americans. They killed this nomination with the help of the Republican leadership who did as they were told. And they're just getting started.

This week, the House passed a bill which would prevent women who serve in our military or who are on military bases with their servicemen husbands from getting abortions at base hospitals, even if they pay for it and no matter what the circumstances. Imagine a servicewoman in a foreign country, a remote location without good medical facilities or even a safe blood supply. This House bill would say, "If you can spend thousands of dollars to fly back to the United States for a safe and legal procedure, you're all right; otherwise you may have to risk your life in a hospital far from home." Why? Because she voluntarily enlisted to serve her country. So that a woman who's willing to risk her life for her country should also have to risk her life for a legal medical procedure. This seems to me to be too extreme.

In a few days, the House will actually try to cut off Federal funds for abortions for poor women that arise from rape or incest. Even those with strong antiabortion feelings know this is a tough issue, and most people think it ought to be left to individual citizens. It's one thing to say that the taxpayers should not pay for a legal abortion that arises from a poor woman's own decision. That's one thing. Quite another to say that the same rules apply to rape and incest.

This is a big, diverse country. We are deeply divided over many issues, none more than the painful and difficult issue of abortion. The law now is that the woman, not the Government, makes a decision until the third trimester when a baby can live independently of his mother and therefore the Government can prohibit abortions.

There are some who believe that America now must toe their line and that every woman must live by their rules, even though the Constitution, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, says exactly the reverse. They'll stop at nothing to get their way. And this week it looks like the Republican leaders in Congress have given them the keys to the store. Looks like they'll vote for any bill, oppose any nomination, allow any intrusion into people's lives if they get orders to do so from these groups.

Many, many Americans oppose abortion. And everyone agrees it's a tragedy. I believe we should all work to reduce the number of abortions through vigorous campaigns to promote abstinence among young people; reduce out-of-wedlock pregnancy, especially among teenagers; and promote more adoptions. I believe, in short, that we ought to all do more of the kind of things that Henry Foster has been doing for decades.

If people in Washington spent less time using abortion to divide the country for their own political ends and more time following Dr. Foster's example of fighting these problems, there would be a lot fewer abortions in America and we'd be a lot stronger as a country.

We need more citizens like Henry Foster willing to commit their time, their energy, and love to fighting for our children, our families, and our future.

Thanks for listening.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:06 a.m. from the Pine Bluff Convention Center in Pine Bluff, AR.

Interview With Susan Yoachum of the San Francisco Chronicle in Pine Bluff, Arkansas

June 24, 1995

The President. Hello.

Ms. Yoachum. Hello, Mr. President.

The President. How are you?

Ms. Yoachum. I'm fine. It's very good of you to call, so I'll get right to it.

The President. Where are you?

Ms. Yoachum. I'm in Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

The President. It's a great town.

United Nations

Ms. Yoachum. Actually, it is. I'm following around one of your newest—well, not your newest rivals but one of the newest candidates for President on the Republican side, Pete Wilson.

So let me begin by asking you about your speech on Monday concerning the 50th anniversary of the United Nations. How do you plan to outline ways for the U.N. to reconstitute itself for the next 50 years?

The President. Well, I think we have to, first of all, recognize that—I think there are two fundamental realities we have to recognize. Number one is that the end of the cold war gives the U.N. the possibility of living up to the dreams of its founders in ways that were simply impossible when the world was divided into two large blocs. And so I think there should be a lot of hope about the U.N.

The second thing I think we have to recognize is that in order for that hope to be realized, the U.N. has got to be properly run and, in particular, the peacekeeping operations have to be properly run. And the United States has spent a lot of time, because we pay a lot of the costs of the U.N., analyzing how the overall operations can be more efficient and cost-effective and inspire more confidence in the countries that are paying the bills and, in particular, looking at the peacekeeping operations and setting up systems to make sure that we use peacekeeping when it will work, that we restrain it when the situation is not right, and that the com-

mand-and-control operations are absolutely clear, that we don't have any kind of mixed signals and crossed lines that have sometimes happened in the past.

I think those are the two fundamental realities you start with. And then when you look ahead into the future, I think it's clear that the new problems of the 21st century are likely to be rooted in ethnic, religious, and other internal problems within countries and across borders; dealing with or helping to avoid natural disasters that are brought on by a combination of population explosion and natural problems like the inability to produce food; and the rise of terrorism and the danger of proliferation of biological, chemical, and small-scale nuclear weapons.

I think—and so I want to talk about kind of the threats to the future security of the members of the United Nations and how we have a new set of threats, an unprecedented opportunity, and we have to clean up our—operate—clean up implies—that has the wrong implication. I don't want to imply that there's anything unsavory about it, but it's just that the operation, I think, really needs to be streamlined and reformed in order to inspire confidence in all the member nations.

As you know, both our—the last two Congresses, one was a Democratic Congress and this Republican Congress, expressed varying levels of opposition to some of the U.N. operations. But the last Congress was far more focused on getting the U.N. to work right, not having America walk away from its responsibilities and became more isolationist.

So—and therefore, the message—that will be the message. But I will also say back to my fellow Americans and to the Congress that we should continue to support the United Nations, that they do a lot of work in the world that the United States might have to do alone or might eventually be pulled into doing, because they keep problems from becoming as bad as they would otherwise be.

Ms. Yoachum. Mr. President, given the difficulties—the highly publicized difficulties, of course, with the U.N. peacekeeping forces in Bosnia and other U.N. difficulties, doesn't it make more difficult for you to try to sell this to Americans, and don't you run some political risk in trying to do so?

The President. Well, I suppose there's—in a time like this, when a lot of people are bewildered almost by all the things that are going on in the world and the apparent conflicts of all the good forces and the troubling forces rising up at once, there's some political risk in everything. But you have to do what you think is right.

I think the—I think it's important not to define the—first of all, I think it's important not to define the U.N. solely in terms of Bosnia. I mean, there was also—I'd ask the United States to remember that we went into Haiti with a multinational force that restored the Aristide government and democracy, but we were able to hand it off to a U.N. force with even more nations involved, where there were more countries paying for it.

I think most Americans know that there are going to be problems all around the world that affect United States interests and that can affect United States citizens, and it's better to have a larger number of nations working on those problems and a larger number of nations paying for the solutions to those problems.

Bosnia is a unique circumstance because it's in the heart of Europe, but there's a war that's been going on there for 4 years. But if you look at it, the people in Northern Ireland fought for 25 years, the people in the Middle East fought for more than four decades before there was any peace progress there. And for all the frustration people in our country have with the problems in Bosnia, the casualty rates have gone way, way down since the U.N. forces went on the ground there and since the United States began to support them with massive humanitarian airlifts and with our operation to keep the war from going into the air. That's what Captain O'Grady was doing when he was shot down; he was enforcing the no-fly zone. And I think it's important never to forget that. Before the United Nations became involved and before we became as aggressive as we were in trying to provide air help, in 1992, there were about 130,000 people killed in that civil war. In 1994, the death rate was down to under—about 3,500. So I think that it's important, even in Bosnia, to keep this in perspective.

The United Nations did not succeed in ending the war in Bosnia. The United Nations did not go in there to militarily defeat the Bosnian Serbs, and they're not capable of doing that, and that was never what they were established—that's not what they were sent there to do. But the war has become less violent and has been at least contained to Bosnia and has not spread beyond its borders. So with all of our frustrations, I think it's important to remember that.

Ms. Yoachum. You'll be doing a number of things in your speech on Monday, which has been, I think, widely anticipated around the world. And certainly, the patron saint of the U.N. 50 celebration, Walter Shorenstein, says that it's a real opportunity for you to give a world-class speech. Having said that, and you having said that you're going to outline your hope for the U.N. given the changing circumstances of the world, what part of your speech—what will you say in your speech to address some of the criticisms, particularly by key Republicans, of the United States' involvement in 1995 in the U.N.?

The President. Well, I will—consider the alternatives. I mean, here the United States is, the world's only superpower militarily, with other countries becoming increasingly wealthy, where there are other countries willing to put their troops on the ground in their own trouble spots and not asking us to do it, like Bosnia, and willing to pay an increasingly large share of running the United Nations. And now we have people in our country and, most importantly, people in our Congress, who want to walk away from our global responsibilities and walk away from the opportunity to cooperate with people in ways that permit others to carry some share of the load.

You know, sometimes I get the feeling that some of the critics of our cooperation with other countries want it both ways. They want to be able to run the world and tell everybody exactly how to behave, and then not have to cooperate with anybody when they have a slight difference of opinion from us or even if they're willing to put their troops on the ground and put their money up.

That's the case in Bosnia, where the Europeans said, "We'll take the lead. We'll put our troops on the ground. This will be paid for through the United Nations, so you won't have to pay for any more than your regular assessment. We ask you for your air power and the support of the NATO, but we're going to follow the prescribed United Nations policy. We're not going to let the U.S. dictate policy, especially when it's our troops and our lives that are at risk."

And I think we cannot have it both ways. We can't become an isolationist country, and we can't dictate every other country's course. We can't become the world's policemen. And it's better for us to be a leader within the framework of the United Nations, which means that from time to time we will have to cooperate with people and agree on a policy that may reflect more of a consensus than our absolute best desires. But that's what the United Nations was set up to do.

The U.S. is still clearly the dominant country in the United Nations. We still are able to do the things we need to do to be—for example, to keep a firm hand with Serbia; we've been able to keep other countries from lifting the sanctions off Iraq; we've been able to get a tougher line—in many ways, we were able to have our policy in Haiti prevail. But the United Nations is about working with other countries and shared sacrifice, shared contribution, shared decisionmaking, where the U.S. leads but can't control everything. And I think that's the way the world ought to be going forward.

Ms. Yoachum. And so in your speech on Monday, despite the criticism of the U.S. involvement in the U.N., you'll not be backing away from the U.N., but at the same time, you'll also be offering suggestions for reforming it?

The President. Absolutely. I don't intend to back away at all. But I do intend to say that this is going to be a 21st century organization, that it's more than a debating forum and—that involves a collective decision by the community of free nations to deploy people all across the world, not just in military situations, like peacekeeping, but in other ways, where it's going to have to be run very well and it's going to have to be able to inspire the confidence of taxpaying citizens not only in the United States but throughout the world.

But I think—I still think the fundamental fact is that the end of the cold war permits the U.N. to live up to its full potential; that we ought to become—we ought to stay involved, we ought to pay our fair share, and we ought to be very grateful that there are other countries that are willing to spend their money and actually put their people at risk in places where either we wouldn't do it or we don't now have to do it all, we don't have to carry the whole load; and that we ought to be willing to lead in an atmosphere in which we also have to cooperate from time to time, especially when others are making a greater sacrifice and when the problem's in their backyard. And that is—that's the sort of future we ought to want.

And we also ought to be mature enough to recognize that as long as human beings are alive on the Earth, bad things will happen, problems will exist, and that there will never be a complete and easy solution to all the problems in the world. This is not—the world will never be problem-free. But far better this course into the future than either having the nuclear cloud hang over the world, as it did in the cold war, or having the U.S. become an isolationist power, as we did between the wars, and run the risk of other terrible things happening all around the world which would drag us back into another war in the future.

In other words, the course that I advocate is not problem-free because as long as there are people and as long as bad people can get political power in various places, there will always be problems in the world. But it is far better than the alternative, better than what we went through in the cold war and better than having an American isolationism.

Military Base Closings

Ms. Yoachum. Sir, one question away from the U.N., and that is the subject of military bases. One of your political allies, Senator Boxer, has asked you to consider sparing some of the bases in California slated to be closed. At the same time, one of your political opponents, Pete Wilson, plans to attack the administration in a speech this evening in New Hampshire for what he says are artificially low target levels that OMB has given the Department of Defense, which has resulted in a need to close more military bases than necessary to meet the budget targets. I'm wondering first, on the political ally side, if there is any chance that you would spare any of the bases in California, and on the political opponent side, what you would say to that criticism by Governor Wilson?

The President. Well, first of all, let's deal with the base issue. The way the base closings works is—the way the base closing process works is that the commission votes on which bases to close. Then they send it to me in a package, which they will do on July 1st. Then I have three options: I can accept it, in which case it goes to Congress, and unless Congress rejects it, it goes into law; the second option is I can reject it out of hand, in which case there are no base closings; the third option is that I can send it back to the commission with recommended changes. Are you still on?

Ms. Yoachum. Yes, sir.

The President. And I have to tell you that with regard to California, as you know, the McClellan Air Base was not on our list. And it was not on our list, basically—it was not on the Pentagon list for two reasons, both of which I thought were good reasons. One was that California had about 20 percent of the defense investment for the country, but it sustained 40 percent of the base cuts in the first two rounds. Before I became President I thought that was more than enough, and the law provides for economic impact to be considered. The other is that the Pentagon thought that a better way to deal with the problem of over-capacity in what is done at McClellan and down at Kelly Air Force Base in Texas was to shave some of the capacity off all five of the sites around the country and presented a plan to do that. So I'm concerned specifically—I'm concerned about the decision made by the Base Closing Commission there, but I have to be careful about further comment until they send them all to me.

Now secondly, Governor Wilson is just wrong about what he said about defense. Basically, my defense numbers have been about the same as the Republicans of Congress have recommended and what the Pentagon has asked for. And the truth is that the Army

people—all the military people but particularly the Army—will tell you that we have brought the force structure down, we have reduced defense in real dollar terms about 40 percent since 1987 and we have reduced the size of the military by about 40 percent, and we've reduced our base structure, oh, about less than half that, considerably less than half that. So most of the military experts will tell you that the reduction of base structure in the United States and throughout the world has lagged far behind the reduction in numbers of people in the military.

And I have tried to be very sensitive since I've been in office to the economic impact of this, to trying to give these bases a chance to do alternative things like help to develop a civilian mission as well as a military mission, and a lot of that work is being done at McClellan and in some other places as well in California and throughout the country.

But it's just not true to say that inadequate budgets have led to the closing of more bases than were necessary. That's just absolutely untrue. We have, in fact, tried to keep more open than the strict, harsh numbers would dictate, given how much the size of our forces have been reduced. So that's just—it's just not true. I'm sure it's good politics for him to say that in New Hampshire or wherever else, but it's simply not true.

Ms. Yoachum. Sir, one last question. That is——

Deputy Press Secretary Ginny Terzano. Susan, we're going to have to stop this because we now have to depart for our next meeting.

Aid to California and 1996 Election

Ms. Yoachum. Okay, I'm sorry. I was just going to ask the President if Governor Wilson really is the candidate he fears most and if there's any chance that McClellan will or may not open?

The President. Well, first of all, let me just say those two questions are totally independent of one another. From the day I became President I worked hard to help California, and I think the people of California know that. We have given aid because of the earthquakes and the fires on more generous terms than had previously been the case. Thirty-three percent of our defense conversion money to develop new technologies from old defense technologies in the commercial sector have gone into California, a disproportionate amount. An enormous amount of investment has been put into the State because I was so concerned that the California economy had been overly hurt by the defense cutbacks before I showed up and by the global recession. I have also done far more than my two Republican predecessors did to try to combat illegal immigration. And so the record is clear and unambiguous and will not be subject to distortion by anybody between now and 1996.

And in terms of who I fear most, the truth is I don't have a clue. I don't know who's going to win. And I have observed this process for 30 years now at close hand, and one thing I'm absolutely convinced of is that you cannot predict who would be the strongest or the weakest candidate or what the dynamics are going to be. People think—and I don't waste any time thinking about it. I haven't given it 5 minutes thought. Because the Republicans have to pick their nominee, and then whomever is picked will be the nominee, and then I'll launch the election. And I also have to be nominated. So I'm just worrying about doing my job as President, doing the best I can, and we'll see who gets nominated.

Ms. Terzano. Susan, thank you.

Ms. Yoachum. Mr. President, thank you very much.

The President. Goodbye.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:10 a.m. by telephone while en route to Taylor Field. During the interview, Ms. Yoachum referred to Walter H. Shorenstein, chairman, U.N. 50 National Committee.

Interview with Gary Matthews of ESPN in Pine Bluff

June 24, 1995

Mr. Matthews. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Thank you for coming in. I understand that you're a great amateur baseball fan. Did you have the opportunity to play when you were growing up here in Arkansas?

The President. I did. Everybody did when I was a boy, but I was never as good as these guys are.

Mr. Matthews. Well, I'm sure you, like other fans across the country—and having played major league baseball, myself—are happy that the strike is over. It's just so good to see so many fans here in Pine Bluff come out and support amateur sports.

The President. It is. I was delighted when the strike was over. As you know, I did what I could to help bring it to an end, and I think it kind of keeps the spirits of baseball fans up all across America. But the real heart and soul of baseball in our country are people like this, all these fans out here in stands like this all over America today and all these young people that are doing it in this way. They build the spirit of baseball, and they make it possible for a few people like you to rise to the top and have the career that you had.

Mr. Matthews. Well, thank you. I really appreciate that. I understand that you're the first President to come to Pine Bluff in over 100 years. What took you so long?

The President. I was here a lot before I became President. These people in this county were as good to me as any people in our entire State. They carried me on their shoulders through 12 years as Governor and I owed them a trip back here, and I'm honored to be here today.

Mr. Matthews. Well, thank you, Mr. President. Enjoy the game today.

The President. Thank you.

NOTE: The interview began at 1:21 p.m. at Taylor Field, where the President threw the first pitch at the National Amateur All Star Baseball Tournament. Gary Matthews is a former player for the Chicago Cubs baseball team. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this interview.

Remarks at the Dedication Ceremony for the Mahlon Martin Apartments in Little Rock, Arkansas

June 25, 1995

Thank you very much, Mr. Grogan; Mr. Brimberry; my good friend Gary Smith; and all those who helped to make this day possible: Governor Tucker; Congressman Thornton; Mayor Dailey; Mayor Hays; Judge Villines; our secretary of state, Sharon Priest, and state treasurer, Jimmie Lou Fisher; prosecuting attorney Mark Stoler, who drove me in my first campaign 21 years ago; Senator Walker; to the fine young AmeriCorps volunteers here who are participating in this event.

Let me say a word to all of you but especially to those who have come from Washington with me. This is a hometown event, all right, for my friend Mahlon Martin and his wonderful wife, Cheryl. A lot of us have come down here for it, the Federal Highway Administrator, Rodney Slater, and Mr. Lindsey and others. But this is an event of national significance because this is a concrete, specific example of what I have been trying to say to the American people now for 2½ years, which is there is nothing wrong with this country that cannot be solved with what is right with this country, that the best thing to do is not to have a big argument about whether the Government or the private sector ought to solve all our problems because neither can do it, and what we need is a partnership.

I want to thank Mr. Lupberger. I see Mr. Brimberry up here with Mr. Smith—all the people who have been involved with all the banks and all the corporations who have helped in this endeavor. But before I go back to the programs, let me just remind you what this is going to do. These facilities are going to do two things. Most importantly, they are going to give homes to working people who don't have enough money to get by. The real heroes in American society today are the people who get up every day, work a full week, raise their kids the best they can, and do not have enough money to get by. And they deserve a place to live, health care for their kids, decent schools, and safe streets. And if we had it, this country would be in better shape.

Now, that is what this is all about. People are going to be able to afford to live in these places who are out there working for somewhere between $15,000 and $18,000 a year and doing their best to raise their kids, give them a chance to be well-educated and safe and drug-free and have a future. And they deserve this kind of chance. And it happened

because practical people developed partnerships which made it possible. And that happens from programs, and it happens from people.

The second thing I want to say is more personal. As a longtime citizen of this city, I used to run by this street almost every day of my life, by these two buildings. Every day, when laziness didn't get the better of me, I would run by these two buildings, and I would think how beautiful they were and what a shame it was that they weren't being used in a productive way.

These buildings will give an example, a sense of pride, a sense of hope, a sense of possibility to other people. They will make people more proud. They will change the way people think about this neighborhood, this downtown area, and this city. And I want all the people who live here to make sure you take good care of them and to make people proud of them and to prove that this effort was worth doing.

I thank you for the mention of the low-income housing tax credit. It was part of the economic development plan in 1993. The other thing we did in 1993 is to cut the income taxes of all the people who will live in this building who have children, because we don't believe people who work 40 hours a week and have kids in their homes should bring those children up in poverty. If you work full-time, your children ought to be able to live above the poverty line.

We've done other things that make this partnership more possible. We've continued the community development block grants, and the city put about 20 percent of the money into this project because of the community development block grants. It's threatened today in Washington. I hope we can save it. We can cut a lot of spending back, but we're going to have to invest some money back in our people and their future.

We also tried to improve the Community Reinvestment Act to give banks better incentives and better support in reinvesting in the community. And we tried to establish a whole national network of community development banks like the Elk Horn Bank in Arkadelphia which the First Lady and Mahlon and so many others, including the Rockefeller Foundation before Mahlon went there, had to do with establishing. We thank you for making Arkansas a national model in that, and we're trying to do that all around the country. We created over 100 empowerment zones and enterprise communities, of which Little Rock is one, to give people incentives for these kind of partnerships.

Now, most voters can never remember the acronym of LISC, and if you told them what a local initiative support corporation was they wouldn't understand what that is either. But most Americans have enough common sense to know that we don't need to get into an ideological debate and you don't have to be a genius to understand that if people are working for a living and trying to raise their children, they ought to have a decent place to live. And the best way to do it is not to have a huge ideological debate in Washington about whether the Government ought to do it or the private sector ought to do it. The best way to do it is to roll up your sleeves, have a practical partnership, and empower people at the grassroots level to make the most of their own lives.

But I also want to say it requires people. And this is the last point I will make in this brief address on a hot day. I'm not sure I would be President today if it weren't for Mahlon Martin. I remember once when I went to Montreal to give a speech to the international convention of city managers, a fellow from another State—Michigan, I think—came up to me and said, "You know, Mahlon Martin when he was city manager of Little Rock was one of the 10 best city managers in the entire United States of America." Mahlon Martin once wanted to be a pro baseball player. He wound up going to Philander Smith and deferring that dream, and instead he spent his life helping the rest of us live out our dreams. In a way, I know he misses baseball and I know he was glad when the strike was settled, but I think that there are very few baseball players which will have helped as many people live out their dreams as Mahlon Martin has helped in our State, in this community.

In 1983, when I persuaded him to become head of the department of finance and administration, we took office with the State broke, in an illegal financial condition. And the first thing that we had to do to make

Mahlon and the Governor immensely popular was to cut spending one percent across the board, for everything, just to come into compliance with the State law. It was a wonderful way to begin an administration. [*Laughter*]

Then a couple of years later, Governor, in one budget period, Mahlon had to cut spending in one of our budget cycles six times during the recession of the eighties, six times cutting back on things that we desperately wanted to spend more money on, including education.

I used to tell everybody that when I was Governor, Mahlon Martin was the government, and I made the speeches. I never saw a fellow who could tell people no and make them like it better than he did. [*Laughter*] And I think it's because they always knew he wanted to say yes and that he was trying to preserve the financial integrity of the State and the management integrity of the State in ways that would command the confidence of the taxpayers of Arkansas and make it possible for us to do as much for people in their lives as we possibly could.

And when he left the administration and went on to run the Rockefeller Foundation, I think he was actually doing what he was really put on this Earth to do, which was to find new and different and innovative ways for ordinary people to live extraordinary lives. And I can tell you that I have now served with thousands and thousands of remarkable people all across this country. I have had the privilege of knowing more exceptional Americans than almost anyone of my time, solely because of my position. I have never met a finer American or a more gifted public servant than the person we honor today, our friend Mahlon Martin.

This is a plaque presented to Mahlon Martin in grateful appreciation for his 2 years of outstanding service and dedication to the Local Initiative Support Corporation that provided these opportunities that we celebrate today. The most important thing on the plaque is a quote that could have been about Mahlon Martin from Margaret Meade: ''Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has.''

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:25 a.m. at the Mahlon Martin Apartments. In his remarks, he referred to Paul Grogan, president, Local Initiative Support Corp. (LISC); Ron Brimberry, president, Downtown Little Rock Community Development Corp.; Gary Smith, executive vice president, Boatman's Bank; Gov. Jim Guy Tucker of Arkansas; Mayor Jim Dailey of Little Rock, AR; Mayor Patrick Henry Hays of North Little Rock, AR; Floyd G. (Buddy) Villines, Pulaski County judge; and Edwin Lupberger, chairman and chief executive officer, Entergy.

Statement on the Death of Warren Burger

June 25, 1995

Hillary and I are deeply saddened to learn of Justice Burger's passing. Today the Nation mourns the loss of a great public servant.

Justice Burger was a strong, powerful, and visionary Chief Justice who opened the doors of opportunity. As Chief Justice, he was concerned with the administration of the Court, serving with enthusiasm and always making sure it was above reproach.

He also presided over the most important anniversary of our Nation by serving as Chair of the Bicentennial Commission on the Constitution.

His expansive view of the Constitution and his tireless service will leave a lasting imprint on the Court and our Nation. Our prayers are with his family and friends during this time.

Memorandum on Assistance to Haiti

June 23, 1995

Presidential Determination No. 95–28

Memorandum for the Secretary of State
The Secretary of the Treasury
The Secretary of Defense
The Attorney General

Subject: Drawdown of the Commodities and Services from the Inventory and Resources of the Departments of Defense, Justice, Treasury and State to Support Accelerated Training and Equipping of Haitian Police Forces

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 552(c)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, 22 U.S.C. 2348a(c)(2) (the "Act"), I hereby determine that:

(1) as a result of an unseen emergency, the provision of assistance under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act in amounts in excess of funds otherwise available for such assistance is important to the national interests of the United States; and

(2) such unforeseen emergency requires the immediate provision of assistance under Chapter 6 of Part II of the Act.

I therefore direct the drawdown of commodities and services from the inventory and resources of the Departments of Defense, Justice, Treasury and State of an aggregate value not to exceed $7.0 million to support accelerated training, equipping and deployment of Haitian police forces.

The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to report this determination to the Congress and to arrange for its publication in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

NOTE: This memorandum was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 26.

Remarks on the 50th Anniversary of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco, California

June 26, 1995

Thank you very much. Secretary Christopher, Mr. Secretary-General, Ambassador Albright, Bishop Tutu. My good friend Maya Angelou, thank you for your magnificent poem. Delegates to the Charter Conference, distinguished members of the diplomatic corps, the President of Poland, Members of Congress, honored guests, Mayor Jordan, Mr. Shorenstein, people of San Francisco, and friends of the United Nations: The 800 delegates from 50 nations who came here 50 years ago to lift the world from the ashes of war and bring life to the dreams of peacemakers included both giants of diplomacy and untested leaders of infant nations. They were separated by tradition, race, and language, sharing only a vision of a better, safer future. On this day 50 years ago, the dream President Roosevelt did not live to see of a democratic organization of the world was launched.

The charter the delegates signed reflected the harsh lessons of their experience, the experience of the thirties in which the world watched and reacted too slowly to fascist aggression, bringing millions sacrificed on the battlefields and millions more murdered in the death chambers. Those who had gone through this and the Second World War knew that celebrating victory was not enough, that merely punishing the enemy was self-defeating, that instead the world needed an effective and permanent system to promote peace and freedom for everyone.

Some of those who worked at that historic conference are still here today, including our own Senator Claiborne Pell, who to this very day, every day, carries a copy of the U.N. Charter in his pocket. I would last like to ask all of the delegates to the original conference who are here today to rise and be recognized. Would you please stand? [*Applause*]

San Francisco gave the world renewed confidence and hope for the future. On that day President Truman said, "This is proof that nations, like men, can state their differences, can face them, and then can find common ground on which to stand." Five decades later, we see how very much the world has changed. The cold war has given way to freedom and cooperation. On this very day, a Russian spacecraft and an American spacecraft are preparing to link in orbit some 240 miles above the Earth. From Jericho to

Belfast, ancient enemies are searching together for peace. On every continent, nations are struggling to embrace democracy, freedom, and prosperity. New technologies move people and ideas around the world, creating vast new reservoirs of opportunity.

Yet we know that these new forces of integration also carry within them the seeds of disintegration and destruction. New technologies and greater openness make all our borders more vulnerable to terrorists, to dangerous weapons, to drug traffickers. Newly independent nations offer ripe targets for international criminals and nuclear smugglers. Fluid capital markets make it easier for nations to build up their economies but also make it much easier for one nation's troubles first to be exaggerated, then to spread to other nations.

Today, to be sure, we face no Hitler, no Stalin, but we do have enemies, enemies who share their contempt for human life and human dignity and the rule of law, enemies who put lethal technology to lethal use, who seek personal gains in age-old conflicts and new divisions.

Our generation's enemies are the terrorists and their outlaw nation sponsors, people who kill children or turn them into orphans, people who target innocent people in order to prevent peace, people who attack peacemakers, as our friend President Mubarak was attacked just a few hours ago, people who in the name of nationalism slaughter those of different faiths or tribes and drive their survivors from their own homelands. Their reach is increased by technology. Their communication is abetted by global media. Their actions reveal the age-old lack of conscience, scruples, and morality which have characterized the forces of destruction throughout history.

Today, the threat to our security is not in an enemy silo but in the briefcase or the car bomb of a terrorist. Our enemies are also international criminals and drug traffickers who threaten the stability of new democracies and the future of our children. Our enemies are the forces of natural destruction, encroaching deserts that threaten the Earth's balance, famines that test the human spirit, deadly new diseases that endanger whole societies.

So, my friends, in this increasingly interdependent world, we have more common opportunities and more common enemies than ever before. It is, therefore, in our interest to face them together as partners, sharing the burdens and costs and increasing our chances of success.

Just months before his death, President Roosevelt said, "We have learned that we cannot live alone at peace, that our own well-being is dependent on the well-being of other nations far away." Today, more than ever, those words ring true. Yet some here in our own country, where the United Nations was founded, dismissed Roosevelt's wisdom. Some of them acknowledge that the United States must play a strong role overseas but refuse to supply the nonmilitary resources our Nation needs to carry on its responsibilities. Others believe that outside our border America should only act alone.

Well, of course the United States must be prepared to act alone when necessary, but we dare not ignore the benefits that coalitions bring to this Nation. We dare not reject decades of bipartisan wisdom. We dare not reject decades of bipartisan support for international cooperation. Those who would do so, these new isolationists, dismiss 50 years of hard evidence.

In those years we've seen the United Nations compile a remarkable record of progress that advances our Nation's interest and, indeed, the interest of people everywhere. From President Truman in Korea to President Bush in the Persian Gulf, America has built United Nations military coalitions to contain aggressors. U.N. forces also often pick up where United States troops have taken the lead.

As the Secretary of State said, we saw it just yesterday, when Haiti held parliamentary and local elections with the help of U.N. personnel. We saw the U.N. work in partnership with the United States and the people of Haiti, as they labor to create a democracy. And they have now been given a second chance to renew that promise.

On every continent, the United Nations has played a vital role in making people more free and more secure. For decades, the U.N. fought to isolate South Africa, as that regime perpetuated apartheid. Last year, under the

watchful eyes of U.N. observers, millions of South Africans who had been disenfranchised for life cast their first votes for freedom.

In Namibia, Mozambique, and soon we hope in Angola, the United Nations is helping people to bury decades of civil strife and turn their energies into building new democratic nations. In Cambodia, where a brutal regime left more than one million dead in the killing fields, the U.N. helped hundreds of thousands of refugees return to their native land and stood watch over democratic elections that brought 90 percent of the people to the polls. In El Salvador, the U.N. brokered an end to 12 years of bloody civil war and stayed on to help reform the army, bring justice to the citizens, and open the doors of democracy.

From the Persian Gulf to the Caribbean, U.N. economic and political sanctions have proved to be a valuable means short of military action to isolate regimes and to make aggressors and terrorists pay at least a price for their actions: in Iraq, to help stop that nation from developing weapons of mass destruction or threatening its neighbors again; in the Balkans, to isolate aggressors; in North Africa, to pressure Libya to turn over for trial those indicted in the bombing of Pan Am flight 103.

The record of the United Nations includes a proud battle for child survival and against human suffering and disease of all kinds. Every year, UNICEF oral vaccines save the lives of 3 million children. Last year alone the World Food Program, using the contributions of many governments including our own, fed 57 million hungry people. The World Health Organization has eliminated smallpox from the face of the Earth and is making great strides in its campaign to eliminate polio by the year 2000. It has helped to contain fatal diseases like the Ebola virus that could have threatened an entire continent.

To millions around the world, the United Nations is not what we see on our news programs at night. Instead it's the meal that keeps a child from going to bed hungry, the knowledge that helps a farmer coax strong crops from hard land, the shelter that keeps a family together when they're displaced by war or natural disasters.

In the last 50 years, these remarkable stories have been too obscured and the capacity of the United Nations to act too limited by the cold war. As colonial rule broke down, differences between developing and industrialized nations and regional rivalries added new tensions to the United Nations so that too often there was too much invective and too little debate in the General Assembly.

But now the end of the cold war, the strong trend toward democratic ideals among all nations, the emergence of so many problems that can best be met by collective action, all these things enable the United Nations at this 50-year point finally to fulfill the promise of its founders.

But if we want the U.N. to do so, we must face the fact that for all its successes and all its possibilities, it does not work as well as it should. The United Nations must be reformed. In this age of relentless change, successful governments and corporations are constantly reducing their bureaucracies, setting clearer priorities, focusing on targeted results. In the United States we have eliminated hundreds of programs, thousands of regulations. We're reducing our Government to its smallest size since President Kennedy served here, while increasing our efforts in areas most critical to our future. The U.N. must take similar steps.

Over the years it has grown too bloated, too often encouraging duplication, and spending resources on meetings rather than results. As its board of directors, all of us, we, the member states, must create a U.N. that is more flexible, that operates more rapidly, that wastes less and produces more, and most importantly, that inspires confidence among our governments and our people. In the last few years we have seen some good reforms: a new oversight office to hold down costs, a new system to review personnel, a start toward modernization and privatization. But we must do more.

The United Nations supports the proposal of the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Essyi, who spoke so eloquently here earlier this morning, to prepare a blueprint for renewing the U.N. and to approve it before

the 50th General Assembly finishes its work next fall.

We must consider major structural changes. The United Nations simply does not need a separate agency with its own acronym, stationery, and bureaucracy for every problem. The new U.N. must peel off what doesn't work and get behind what will.

We must also realize, in particular, the limits to peacekeeping and not ask the Blue Helmets to undertake missions they cannot be expected to handle. Peacekeeping can only succeed when the parties to a conflict understand they cannot profit from war. We have too often asked our peacekeepers to work miracles while denying them the military and political support required and the modern command-and-control systems they need to do their job as safely and effectively as possible. Today's U.N. must be ready to handle tomorrow's challenges. Those of us who most respect the U.N. must lead the charge of reform.

Not all the critics of today's United Nations are isolationists. Many are supporters who gladly would pay for the U.N.'s essential work if they were convinced their money was being well-spent. But I pledge to all of you, as we work together to improve the United Nations, I will continue to work to see that the United States takes the lead in paying its fair share of our common load.

Meanwhile, we must all remember that the United Nations is a reflection of the world it represents. Therefore, it will remain far from perfect. It will not be able to solve all problems. But even those it cannot solve, it may well be able to limit in terms of the scope and reach of the problem, and it may well be able to limit the loss of human life until the time for solution comes.

So just as withdrawing from the world is impossible, turning our backs on the U.N. is no solution. It would be shortsighted and self-destructive. It would strengthen the forces of global disintegration. It would threaten the security, the interest, and the values of the American people. So I say especially to the opponents of the United Nations here in the United States, turning our back on the U.N. and going it alone will lead to far more economic, political, and military burdens on our people in the future and would ignore the lessons of our own history.

Instead, on this 50th anniversary of the charter signing, let us renew our vow to live together as good neighbors. And let us agree on a new United Nations agenda to increase confidence and ensure support for the United Nations, and to advance peace and prosperity for the next 50 years.

First and foremost, the U.N. must strengthen its efforts to isolate states and people who traffic in terror and support those who continue to take risks for peace in the face of violence. The bombing in Oklahoma City, the deadly gas attack in Tokyo, the struggles to establish peace in the Middle East and in Northern Ireland, all of these things remind us that we must stand against terror and support those who move away from it. Recent discoveries of laboratories working to produce biological weapons for terrorists demonstrate the dangerous link between terrorism and the weapons of mass destruction.

In 1937, President Roosevelt called for a quarantine against aggressions, to keep the infection of fascism from seeping into the bloodstream of humanity. Today, we should quarantine the terrorists, the terrorist groups, and the nations that support terrorism. Where nations and groups honestly seek to reform, to change, to move away from the killing of innocents, we should support them. But when they are unrepentant in the delivery of death, we should stand tall against them. My friends, there is no easy way around the hard question: If nations and groups are not willing to move away from the delivery of death, we should put aside short-term profits for the people in our countries to stop, stop, stop their conduct.

Second, the U.N. must continue our efforts to stem the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. There are some things nations can do on their own. The U.S. and Russia today are destroying our nuclear arsenals rapidly, but the U.N. must also play a role. We were honored to help secure an indefinite extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty under U.N. auspices. We rely on U.N. agencies to monitor nations bent on acquiring nuclear capabilities. We must work together on the Chemical Weapons Conven-

tion. We must strengthen our common efforts to fight biological weapons. We must do everything we can to limit the spread of fissile materials. We must work on conventional weapons like the land mines that are the curse of children the world over. And we must complete a comprehensive nuclear test ban treaty.

Third, we must support through the United Nations the fight against manmade and natural forces of disintegration, from crime syndicates and drug cartels to new diseases and disappearing forests. These enemies are elusive; they cross borders at will. Nations can and must oppose them alone. But we know, and the Cairo conference reaffirmed, that the most effective opposition requires strong international cooperation and mutual support.

Fourth, we must reaffirm our commitment to strengthen U.N. peacekeeping as an important tool for deterring, containing, and ending violent conflict. The U.N. can never be an absolute guarantor of peace, but it can reduce human suffering and advance the odds of peace.

Fifth—you may clap for that. [*Applause*] Fifth, we must continue what is too often the least noticed of the U.N.'s missions, its unmatched efforts on the frontlines of the battle for child survival and against disease and human suffering.

And finally, let us vow to make the United Nations an increasing strong voice for the protection of fundamental human dignity and human rights. After all, they were at the core of the founding of this great organization.

Today we honor the men and women who gave shape to the United Nations. We celebrate 50 years of achievement. We commit ourselves to real reforms. We reject the siren song of the new isolationists. We set a clear agenda worthy of the vision of our founders. The measure of our generation will be whether we give up because we cannot achieve a perfect world or strive on to build a better world.

Fifty years ago today, President Truman reminded the delegates that history had not ended with Hitler's defeat. He said, it is easier to remove tyrants and destroy concentration camps than it is to kill the ideas which give them birth. Victory on the battlefield was essential, but it is not good enough for a lasting, good peace.

Today we know that history has not ended with the cold war. We know, and we have learned from painful evidence, that as long as there are people on the face of the Earth, imperfection and evil will be a part of human nature; there will be killing, cruelty, self-destructive abuse of our natural environment, denial of the problems that face us all. But we also know that here today, in this historic chamber, the challenge of building a good and lasting peace is in our hands and success is within our reach.

Let us not forget that each child saved, each refugee housed, each disease prevented, each barrier to justice brought down, each sword turned into a plowshare, brings us closer to the vision of our founders, closer to peace, closer to freedom, closer to dignity.

So my fellow citizens of the world, let us not lose heart. Let us gain renewed strength and energy and vigor from the progress which has been made and the opportunities which are plainly before us. Let us say no to isolation; yes to reform; yes to a brave, ambitious new agenda; most of all, yes to the dream of the United Nations.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:17 a.m. in the War Memorial Opera House. In his remarks, he referred to United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali; Bishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa; poet Maya Angelou; President Lech Walesa of Poland; Mayor Frank Jordan of San Francisco; Walter H. Shorenstein, chairman, U.N. 50 National Committee; and President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt.

Exchange With Reporters Prior to Discussions With United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali in San Francisco

June 26, 1995

Q. Mr. Secretary-General, will you accept the President's suggestions for reforms of the United Nations?

Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali. Yes, certainly.

Q. Do you think he has a point?

Secretary-General Boutros-Ghali. Yes.

Q. Mr. President, you referred to the new isolationists in your speech. Could you be more specific about who you might mean?

President Clinton. What I've been saying for months now. I think you all know what I mean.

Q. Could you be specific, name who exactly you mean?

Q. Mr. President—[*inaudible*]—the RTC report has vindicated you and the First Lady in Whitewater?

The President. No, I haven't.

NOTE: The exchange began at 12:03 p.m. in the Herbst Auditorium at the War Memorial Veterans Building. A tape was not available for verification of the content of this exchange.

Statement on the Attempted Assassination of President Hosni Mubarak of Egypt

June 26, 1995

On behalf of the American people, I wish to express my outrage at the attempt made today by terrorists to assassinate President Mubarak of Egypt. I am relieved that President Mubarak was not harmed and has now returned safely to Cairo.

The United States stands by Egypt—our partner for peace and prosperity in the Middle East and around the world—at this moment. The enemies of peace will not be allowed to thwart the peaceful hopes of the peoples of the region, and the efforts of President Mubarak and the peace makers to make those hopes a reality.

Statement on the Supreme Court Decision on the Student Athlete Drug Testing Case

June 26, 1995

Today's decision by the Supreme Court in the *Vernonia School District* v. *Acton* case sends exactly the right message to parents and students: drug use will not be tolerated in our schools. The decision reinforces the point that young people should not use drugs.

I applaud the decision of the Supreme Court which upholds the right of the Vernonia (Oregon) School District to conduct random drug testing of school athletes as one effort by local school authorities to reduce drug use among students.

The Solicitor General argued strongly in support of the school district's position. My administration's support for the right of school officials to properly test their high school athletes is part of our overall strategy to make schools places where young people can be safe and drug-free. I believe that to be a good student or a good athlete a student cannot use drugs. Drug use at schools will not and should not be tolerated.

Letter to Congressional Leaders Transmitting a Report on Cyprus

June 26, 1995

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

In accordance with Public Law 95–384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I submit to you this report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report covered progress through March 31, 1995. The current report covers April 1, 1995 through May 31, 1995.

The central event of this period was the May 21–23 exploratory talks between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots. These talks were held in London and facilitated by Presidential Emissary Beattie and Special Cyprus Coordinator Williams. The talks laid the groundwork for a second visit to the island by Mr. Beattie to explore possible areas of agreement between Greek-Cypriot leader Clerides and Turkish-Cypriot leader Denktash.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Jesse Helms, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Message to the Senate Transmitting the Mongolia-United States Investment Treaty

June 26, 1995

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Treaty Between the United States of America and Mongolia Concerning the Encouragement and Reciprocal Protection of Investment, with Annex and Protocol, signed at Washington on October 6, 1994. Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the Treaty, with Annex and Protocol.

The bilateral investment Treaty (BIT) with Mongolia will protect U.S. investors and assist Mongolia in its efforts to develop its economy by creating conditions more favorable for U.S. private investment and thus strengthening the development of the private sector.

The Treaty is fully consistent with U.S. policy toward international and domestic investment. A specific tenet of U.S. policy, reflected in this Treaty, is that U.S. investment abroad and foreign investment in the United States should receive national treatment. Under this Treaty, the Parties also agree to international law standards for expropriation and compensation for expropriation; free transfer of funds associated with investments; freedom of investments from performance requirements; fair, equitable, and most-favored-nation treatment; and the investor's or investment's freedom to choose to resolve disputes with the host government through international arbitration.

I recommend that the Senate consider this Treaty as soon as possible, and give its advice and consent to ratification of the Treaty, with Annex and Protocol, at an early date.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 26, 1995.

Remarks to the Cuban-American Community

June 27, 1995

I want to speak with you today about my administration's plans to press forward with our efforts to promote a peaceful transition to democracy in Cuba. A little more than a month ago, I took steps to stop the dangerous and illegal flow of Cubans attempting to enter the United States by sea. I want to report to you on the results of these steps and why I believe it was the right thing to do. But first, let me be clear: our commitment to a better future for the Cuban people remains as strong as ever.

Throughout our hemisphere, a powerful wave of democracy is bringing new respect for human rights, free elections, and free markets. Thirty-four of the thirty-five countries in this region have embraced democratic change. Only one nation resists this trend, Cuba.

Cuba's system is at a dead end politically, economically, and spiritually. The Castro regime denies Cubans their most basic rights. They cannot speak freely. They cannot organize to protest. They cannot choose their own leaders. At the same time, economic collapse threatens the well-being of every man, woman, and child in Cuba.

The pressure of our embargo and the withdrawal of Soviet support have forced Cuba to adopt some economic measures of reform in the last 2 years. We haven't seen that before. But economic change remains slow, stubborn, and painfully inadequate. The denial of basic rights and opportunities has driven tens of thousands of Cubans to desperation.

In the summer of 1994, thousands took to treacherous waters in unseaworthy rafts, seeking to reach our shores; an undetermined number actually lost their lives. In response, I ordered Cubans rescued at sea to be taken to safe haven at our naval base at Guantanamo and, for a time, in Panama. But this could not be a long-term solution. Last fall, I ordered that the young, the old, and the infirm and their immediate families be admitted to our country. Thousands entered

the United States in this way. Still, that left tens of thousands of young men at Guantanamo who were becoming increasingly frustrated and desperate. Senior United States military officials warned me that unrest and violence this summer were likely, threatening both those in the camps and our own dedicated soldiers.

But to admit those remaining in Guantanamo without doing something to deter new rafters risked unleashing a new, massive exodus of Cubans, many of whom would perish seeking to reach the United States. To prevent that situation and to settle the migration issue, I took action. The Cuban rafters who were brought to Guantanamo last summer will be admitted to the United States, except those found to be inadmissible under U.S. law. Those Cubans rescued at sea while illegally trying to enter the United States will be taken back to Cuba. Under our generous program of legal immigration, 20,000 Cubans from Cuba will be allowed to enter and reside in the United States every year from now on. And we'll continue to provide assistance to Florida to help resettle those Cuban migrants.

I know that many of you have questions about aspects of this policy. Yet, the simple truth is that there is no realistic alternative. We simply cannot admit all Cubans who seek to come here. We cannot let people risk their lives on open seas in unseaworthy rafts. And we cannot sentence thousands of young men to live in limbo at Guantanamo.

Our new policy is working. Since its beginning on May 2d, few Cubans have been intercepted at sea. We cannot know how many lives have been saved by the deterrent effect of this policy. But consider this: In May of last year, some 700 Cubans were picked up and many others were lost at sea. Our new policy can help to avoid uncontrolled migration, and it's already saving lives.

At the same time, we are making every effort to protect those at risk in Cuba. We will not return rafters who we believe would suffer reprisals back in Cuba. The U.S. Interests Section in Havana is carefully monitoring those sent home, visiting each of them individually to ensure they are not harassed. And thanks to our legal migration programs, over 15,000 Cubans have been approved to enter the United States since September 1994 as immigrants, parolees, and refugees. That is 3 times more than in any previous year.

In short, the actions we took address the serious humanitarian problem at Guantanamo, deter illegal and unsafe migration, protect political refugees, and expand opportunities for legal admission from Cuba. They serve our national interests.

Regularizing Cuban migration also helps our efforts to promote a peaceful transition to democracy on the island. For too long, Castro has used the threat of uncontrolled migration to distract us from this fundamental objective. With the steps I have taken, we are now able to devote ourselves fully to our real, long-term goal.

Our policy is rooted in the Cuban Democracy Act, which I endorsed some 3 years ago and which subsequently passed the Congress with bipartisan support. Consistent with the act, the United States will maintain the economic embargo against the Cuban regime. This is an important way to promote change in Cuba, and it will remain in place until we see far-reaching political and economic reform. As provided in the act, if Cuba takes steps in the direction of meaningful change, we are also prepared to respond with our own carefully calibrated responses.

The Cuban Democracy Act also calls on us to support the Cuban people in their struggle for democracy and economic well-being. We believe that reaching out today will nurture and strengthen the fledgling civil society that will be the backbone of tomorrow's democratic Cuba. We will continue to help Cuba's democratic opposition and the churches, human rights organizations, and others seeking to exercise the political and economic rights that should belong to all Cubans.

Throughout the Americas, dictatorships have given way to democracy. They are following the path of reconciliation and forgiveness preached by Cuba's first Cardinal, Jaime Ortega, during his recent visit here to the United States. Cuba will follow this course of its neighbors. With the support of the American people and their representatives in Congress, we can move forward toward our common goal of a peaceful transition to de-

mocracy in Cuba. I hope that it will be my privilege as President to welcome a free Cuba back into the community of democratic nations.

NOTE: The President's remarks were videotaped at noon on June 7 in the Oval Office at the White House for later broadcast, and they were released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 27.

Remarks at the Opening Session of the Pacific Rim Economic Conference in Portland, Oregon

June 27, 1995

Thank you very much. Mayor Katz, Governor Kitzhaber; I want to thank the people of Portland who have done so much to make us feel at home here; Secretary Peña for cosponsoring the conference; all the members of the Cabinet and the administration who get to do their jobs in Portland, in the real world today instead of back in Washington; President Ramaley; Congresswoman Furse; Governor Lowry. Let me also thank the Coast Guard for all the work that they have done to help us succeed here.

Let me begin by saying I wanted some heated exchanges here today, but I have already overdone it. [*Laughter*]. This is a working conference. We will not be offended if you take your jackets off, roll your sleeves up. It would suit me if the gentlemen here present want to take your ties off. I won't be offended. I think you better stop there. [*Laughter*]

I have really looked forward to this for quite some time. I had a wonderful experience when we came to Portland shortly after I became President for the timber conference. And a lot of ideas were generated out of that which clearly affected the work of our administration in terms of getting an aid package through Congress to help to pay for economic conversion in disadvantaged communities and a lot of other very specific things.

When I was Governor, I used to go out across my State secure in the knowledge that even in every State there is no such thing as a State economy, that within each State the regions are dramatically different in their possibilities and their problems. And I do not believe that our National Government can have a sound economic policy without continuing to establish partnerships and to listen to people who live in various regions of the United States. And that's why we're doing this series of conferences today.

I also think that, as all of you know, as a former Governor, that a lot of the best ideas in the country are not in Washington and don't get there unless you go out and find them. In preparation for this conference, I was given a remarkable biography of the remarkable Oregon Governor Tom McCall, that was written by a man that works for the Oregonian, Brent Walth, and now, according to—I know that no one in the press ever gets it wrong, so I'm sure this book was right in every respect. [*Laughter*] The most impressive thing about the book to me, maybe because of my own experiences with my own mother, was that once Governor McCall's mother was having trouble getting a hold of him, so she called the White House because she heard that the White House could get in touch with anybody, and she actually got President Johnson on the phone and said that she needed to talk to her son. And President Johnson called the Governor and told him to call his mother. [*Laughter*]

Now, that is the kind of full-service Federal Government I have sought to bring to the American people. [*Laughter*] And that is the tradition we are trying to build on.

As the Vice President said, we are here to, first of all review the facts about the region's economy, the good things and the bad things, the barriers to progress, and the possibilities. We are here to determine the impact of the present policies of our administration on that and to get as many new, clear, specific suggestions as possible for where we should go together.

I think it is important to do these things because too often the further you get away from the grassroots in America, the more theoretical and the less practical the debates become. And that is especially true now because we're at an historic watershed period in American history. We won the cold war, but we no longer have a common enemy and a common way of organizing ourselves and thinking about how we should relate to the rest of the world.

So yesterday I went to San Francisco to the 50th anniversary of the United Nations, to try to talk about why we, more than ever, should be working with other countries in partnerships to advance our values and our interests and our security.

And today I say to you that a lot of our economy was organized around our responsibilities in the cold war. And today we know it has to be organized around the realities of a global economy, the information age, and the fact that for many decades, before the end of the cold war, we financed our continuing leadership in that war and our needs at home with massive deficits, which lowered savings rates, lowered investment rates, and put us into some very difficult circumstances, which mean today that we're in the second decade in which most Americans are working a longer work week than they were 20 years ago for about the same or lower wages and at which all these wonderful changes that we find thrilling and exciting, the global society, the rapid movement of money and information, the constant downsizing of big organizations, but the explosion of new ones—because even though we have downsizing of big corporations, in '93 and '94 both we set new records for the incorporation of new businesses—all these things in the aggregate are quite exciting. But if you're just someone caught up in a very new world, who has to worry about paying a mortgage and educating your children and taking care of your parents' health care, they can be very threatening as well.

And over and over and over again we hear all over the country people say, "Well, I know these numbers look good, I know we've got almost 7 million new jobs, but I'm still worried about losing mine. It may be that the economy is growing, but I haven't gotten a raise. I know we've got the best health care in the world, but I lost my coverage at my job last year. I know we have to grow the economy, but how can we do it and preserve our precious environmental heritage so that America as we know it will still be around for our grandchildren?"

These questions are coming at us. They also come from the other way. They say, "Well, we're caught in a bind; I know we have to preserve the economy, but I've got to feed my family tomorrow. I know that we have to advance the environment and I'm worried about other people's economic interests, but what about mine?"

In other words, this is an interesting time in which the clear, simple, monolithic way we used to look at the world, the cold war abroad, constant economic progress at home, steady, slow, certain resolution of our social difficulties, all those things are kind of out the window. And there are more possibilities than ever before, but it's pretty confusing for folks out there. And a lot of people are genuinely scared and worried. And what we have to do is to chart a new course based on our fundamental values.

I personally believe that the debate that has gone on in Washington is understandable, given the national confusion and frustration, but it's way too extreme. We're debating things that I thought were resolved 70 years ago. To me, the issue is not, would we be better off if the Government solved all our problems? Nobody believes that can be done anymore. But it is certainly not, wouldn't we be better off if the Government did nothing but national defense, cut taxes, and balance the budget tomorrow without regard to consequences?

The clear thing it seems to me is we ought to be asking ourselves, how do we have to change our Government to get the kind of policies that advance the American dream, that grow the middle class, shrink the under class, enhance our security and our quality of life, deal with the issues of the day in practical fashion? What kind of partnerships do we need?

That's the way I tend to look at the world, probably because I was a Governor before I became President. But it's also the thing I think that will work. You heard what the Vice President said: In the last 2 years we have cut the deficit by a trillion dollars over 7 years; we have seen a lot of new jobs. Even in some rural counties in Oregon, the unemployment rate has gone down, notwithstanding the difficulties caused by the timber issues.

We have tried to expand trade in unprecedented ways. We have had more than 80 new trade agreements, the big ones like NAFTA and GATT and others on specific things that

permit us to sell everything from Washington apples to California rice to software and cellular telephones in Japan for the first time.

And I believe it is clear to everybody that what we have to focus on is reducing the deficit, expanding trade but also increasing the capacity of the American people to make the most of their own lives and enhancing our own security. So that's why I have also focused on the need to invest more in education, training, and research and the need to dramatically improve the ability of the Government to do its job, because if we're going to cut back and cut back and cut back it becomes even more important what we do spend money on.

That's why we try to support things like the Oregon initiative. That's why we've given now 29 States permission to get out from under Federal rules to try their own hand at reforming the welfare system, to move people from welfare to work. That's why we abolished another 16,000 governmental regulations the other day. And these are things that are profoundly important to all of you.

As we look ahead, I just want to say a couple of things and then I want to hear from the panel. We're going to have a big debate this year about what should be done about our budget deficit. I believe it's important to balance the budget. I believe it's important to have a clear path to get there. And I think it's important for two reasons. One is we never had a permanent structural deficit in the United States until 1981. Now, we ran a deficit all during the 1970's because of the oil price problems and because we had something called stagflation. And those of you who were of age in those years understand what happened to our economy. So conventional economic theory called for us to try to keep stimulating the economy a little bit in those years.

But we never had a big, permanent deficit until 1981, when there was a sort of unspoken agreement between the major party leaders in Washington. The Republicans didn't want to raise taxes to get rid of the deficit and the Democrats didn't want to cut too much spending, and besides that, both of them knew that economic growth in America fueled by investment and productivity had reached a very low level and the only way to keep the economy going was through a big deficit. But we have paid a terrible price for it.

Meanwhile, the private sector is much more productive now, much more competitive. And we cannot afford to continue to run our economic business with a permanent deficit, in my opinion. On the other hand, there is a right way and a wrong way to do it. An economic study recently done by the Wharton School of Business in Pennsylvania pointed out that if we reduce the deficit too fast and specifically analyze the Senate proposal, that it could bring on a recession, increase unemployment to 8.6 percent, and basically undermine what we want to do.

That's why I proposed balancing the budget over 10 years, doing it in a way that increases investment in education, medical research, and technology, not reduces it; cuts everything else in the nondefense area about 20 percent across the board; and reduces Medicare and Medicaid inflation more moderately than the Republican proposals, so that we don't have to cut services primarily to elderly people who don't have enough money to live on as it is.

In order to get to my budget, you have to have a much smaller tax cut; focus it on education, child rearing, and the middle class; and take 10 years instead of 7. But this is the sort of debate I think we ought to be having, in other words, not some big theoretical debate about what's good and evil in some theory but how is this going to affect the American people?

Same thing—I'll just give you one other example about the environment. We'll have a chance to talk about this today. It seems to me what we ought to be focused on here and what you all—most of you at least—said you wanted when I came out here to the forest conference is, how can we guarantee long-term sustainable development that preserves the natural resources, that makes people want to live here in the first place, but enables the maximum number of people to make a decent living in the most diverse and acceptable ways to sustain the environment?

In Washington, the debate often gets so theoretical that you got some people saying, "I think it's a very nice thing if the environment's preserved, but the Government

would mess up a one-car parade, so we ought to get out of it anyway.'' The other day we had a congressional subcommittee actually vote to repeal the ban on offshore oil drilling for every part of America, Florida, New Jersey, California, everybody, no analysis, no nothing. Why? It was pure ideology. Yesterday they reversed the vote after they heard from the people. But you see what I'm saying. In other words, it's—one of the things that I really want to come out of this is a practical sense of what we should be doing.

Finally, let me say, there's one other big issue in the news today that affects the Pacific Northwest, and I want to mention that. That of course is the question of our trade talks with Japan. First, let me say there's nobody who's done more than our administration to try to open opportunities for Americans to sell in Japan. And I have also kept a very open door to Japanese products in America. We are, as I mentioned earlier, we're selling apples, rice, software, cellular telephones, computer technology previously prohibited by cold war legislation, all these things we're selling in Japan and the rest of Asia, many of them for the very first time.

I supported the GATT trade agreement. I supported NAFTA. I believe in this. I understand that Japanese cars are made now in Oregon and sent back to Japan for sale. I know all that. I know that Washington State is the most trade-sufficient State in the United States in dealing with the Pacific Rim. This is the future I want.

But you also have to understand in the context of this negotiation, we still have a huge and persistent trade deficit with Japan. More than half of it is in autos and auto parts. We have a trade surplus in auto parts with the rest of the world because we are the low-cost, high-quality producer of auto parts in the world, but we still have a $12.5 billion trade deficit with Japan, partly because they make carburetors in Japan and sell them for 3 times as much in Japan as they do here.

The luxury car issue you've heard talked about, that's the sanction that I propose unless we can reach an agreement here of tariffs on luxury cars, those cars are selling, made in Japan, selling for $9,000 more there than here. We have to seek fair trade. No matter how many jobs are created by a country's trade, if they have a $100 billion trade surplus by constantly closing the economic channels of access, more is lost than gained. And this is not good for Japan. They're awash in cash, but they can't have any economic growth. They have no inflation, no growth, and they're moving toward negative interest rates in the Japanese economy. The average Japanese working person looks like they have a huge income, but they can't afford housing and their consumer costs are almost 40 percent higher than Americans for virtually everything. So they are paying a terrible price.

I want to tell you, the people of the Pacific Northwest, I am not trying to launch a new era of protectionism, but we have tried now for two or three decades to open this market, and this is the last major block to developing a sensible global economic policy. If the United States is going to lower its deficit in ways that promote growth and raise incomes, then the rest of the world has to also make their economic adjustments because we can't deficit-spend the world into prosperity any more. Others have to do their part as well.

That is what this is about. The bottom line is we want to open the markets for American products. And we will take action if necessary in the form of sanctions. We hope it will not be necessary. We hope it will not have an adverse effect in the short run on anyone. But over the long run, if we're going to build the kind of global economic system we want, everyone must change.

Meanwhile, I will get back to basics here. It is not enough for this country to produce impressive economic numbers. It must be manifest in the lives of the people of America. So I ask you to give us your best thoughts about where we are and where we're going and what you think we should do to renew the American dream and to maintain our leadership in a new and exciting world that is full of opportunities and challenges.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at approximately 9:45 a.m. in Smith Memorial Center at Portland State University. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Vera Katz of Portland; Gov. John A. Kitzhaber of Oregon; Judith A. Ramaley, president, Portland State University; and Gov. Mike Lowry of Washington.

Remarks at the Closing Session of the Pacific Rim Economic Conference in Portland

June 27, 1995

First of all, let me thank this panel and—all of them. I do have to say one thing in deference to Quincy Jones' humor and modesty. You should all know, if you don't, that in the aggregate, I think second only to airplanes, entertainment is our second biggest export. So when all these folks are talking about piracy and opening markets to nontraditional things you don't normally think about being exported, that's a huge deal in the American entertainment industry. It generates untold thousands of jobs, and they're not just the kind of jobs you think about—every time you look at a movie and you see all the people at the end that work on a movie and you imagine what their incomes are like, what their lives are like, just remember, those people, their ability to keep their jobs over a constant long period of time depends upon our ability to be effective in exporting that product as well.

One of the things that we tried to do—and Tom was talking about this—after we took office, was to identify those things where—like apples from Washington—where we knew good and well there would be a consumer market in other countries if only we could pierce them. So there wasn't some sort of theoretical thing. We knew that.

And finally let me say again, this relates to higher wage jobs, because export-related jobs on balance pay about 15 percent higher than jobs where the total nature of the economic activity is within the border of the United States.

Let me give you this thought in closing. Agricultural exports have gone up $9 billion, to over $50 billion a year, since this administration took office. And we've got a surplus of about $20 billion, as I said. Exports to Asia alone reached a record of $18.6 billion—that's 45,000 jobs. That's just agriculture. The Washington Apple Commission has tripled exports. And Washington apple exports to Asia increased 37 percent last year alone. That's just one example.

Now, I'll close with a general point I want to make. I came out here because I really believe that this is what public life should be about—not just this panel, but all three of them—not the kind of rhetorical and highly partisan divisions that normally come to you across the airwaves from a distant National Government.

Also I believe—if you think about it, when World War II was over, we had a remarkable thing happen with President Truman and the Republican leaders of the Congress where we set up NATO, we set up the Marshall Plan, we set up—we really filled out and finished the work of the United Nations. And we had this bipartisan foreign policy, because everybody thought we could be destroyed by nuclear war or by the success of communism over democratic capitalism.

So we fought like crazy about all kinds of domestic issues, but we basically organized ourselves around the issues that were critical to our survival. I think you could argue that in the world toward which we're moving, our survival, our security as a people relate very closely to the issues discussed by these three panels today. And we need to find a way to go beyond partisanship to reach some national consensus on issues of trade and innovation, on issues of education and training, on issues of organizing work and family and education in a way that enables people to make the most of their own lives and on the question of pushing more and more decisions down to the community level but using the National Government as a partner to spark economic activity and get us through tough economic transitions.

That is what I am trying to do. As you can see, the results are mixed from time to time. But it's clear that that's what the country needs to do. You would not run a family, a business, a charitable organization, a local project in the way our national politics is too often run, at a highly theoretical, highly rhetorical, highly ideological level, when what we're really trying to do is to find new patterns in which people can make more of their own lives.

So I ask all of you to think about that. How would you define our security, moving into the 21st century? And if you believe it relates to innovation, to education, to training, to exports, to all these things, then I ask you: Do what you can to help us to build a bipartisan

consensus that will take this country into the next century in the way that all these fine people that were on all these panels plainly deserve.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:37 p.m. in Smith Memorial Center at Portland State University. In his remarks, he referred to musician Quincy Jones.

Remarks to Students at Portland State University in Portland

June 27, 1995

Thank you very much. First, President Ramaley, thank you for having us here at this wonderful campus. You know, I used to be a college teacher. My wife and I started out our married life teaching at the University of Arkansas in the Ozark Mountains. And I was looking at all of you under these beautiful trees, thinking there are a lot of days when I might like to be back here working for you here. This is a very wonderful place, and I thank you for having us here.

Thank you, Congresswoman Elizabeth Furse, for being here with us today and for your leadership, your vision, and your conscience. I can tell you all you are very, very fortunate to be represented by one of the most truly extraordinary individuals in the United States House of Representatives in Elizabeth Furse.

I want to thank Governor Kitzhaber, and I want to thank Mayor Katz, who I believe is over there—thank you, Vera, you've been great. And Portland has been wonderful to us. I've never had a bad day in Portland, Oregon, and I certainly didn't today. This is wonderful.

And you know, the Vice President really is funny, isn't he? [*Laughter*] You should have seen him back here when Elizabeth was introducing him and saying how intelligent he was and how energetic he was and how funny he was. And I whispered in his ear right before he came up, I said, "Next thing she's going to say is how pretty you are." [*Laughter*] But she restrained herself, and he was able to compose himself and give that wonderful speech. Let me say that our Nation has been very lucky because there's no doubt that in the entire history of the Republic, Al Gore is the most effective, influential person ever to be Vice President of the United States.

Let me tell you just for a minute what we were really doing here today at this regional economic conference. We were worried about what Oregon and what the Pacific Northwest will be like for all you young people here in the audience. We were worried about how we can guarantee a future, how we can move into the next century with the American dream alive and well and with the leadership and values of our country secure, in a world that is full of possibility and full of uncertainty.

You know, most of us who are my age and older, we've lived most of our lives and our course is pretty well set. And we have been very, very blessed to grow up in a country and to have the opportunities that America has offered for all the decades since the end of the Second World War.

Now, at the end of the cold war, the dawn of the global economy, the information age, moving into a new century, into a new millennium, we look out at a world that is changing so rapidly, that is full of untold possibilities but also some pretty troubling developments; a world that has left a lot of people feeling robust and secure and hopeful and eager for the future and a world that has left a lot of people feeling at a minimum kind of confused and uncertain and concerned about their future.

If you go back and ask yourself, what is the responsibility of the President and what is the responsibility of the citizenry of the United States, you can do no better than to go back to the documents of our Founders, who believed that we are all created equal and endowed by our Creator with the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That means that at any point in history, but particularly at those points of great change, our responsibility is to do what is necessary to help us make the most of our lives. All of us, without regard to race or region or income or background or religion, have the right to make the most of our own lives. That is the challenge that is facing us here today.

And I believe that that challenge requires us, number one, to create more economic

opportunity, more jobs, and higher incomes; number two, to give people the tools they need to develop their God-given abilities; number three, to promote the security of the United States at home and abroad; number four, to preserve the natural heritage of the United States that has brought us to this point and that we want to pass on to our children, our grandchildren, and our grandchildren's grandchildren.

And finally, in a world which is increasingly fast-changing and decentralized, it requires those of us in the National Government, to use the Vice President's term, to literally reinvent the way the Government works, to set a course, to pursue the right priorities, but to make sure that people at the grassroots level can make the fundamental decisions affecting their own lives and can look across the table at people who are different from themselves and work out those differences in a spirit of genuine friendship and good citizenship.

These are the thing we have tried to do in the last 2½ years, and these are the things that will take America into the 21st century.

I just want to close by asking you to think about one or two very important issues. We're in a big debate in Washington now, not only about how to balance the budget—that's the good news; most people agree that we should do it—but about the fundamental purposes of Government. There are those who say today that the Government is intrinsically destructive of our way of life and has no role other than national defense, tax cuts, and eliminating whatever you have to to balance the budget as quickly as possible.

There are those of us who beg to differ, who believe that the Government is nothing more than the expression of the American people and that when it works best, its fundamental duty is the duty of partnership, to help people do things together that they cannot do on their own. That is a debate I hope you will side with us on.

There are those who believe, for example, that it's a very nice thing if you can preserve the environment but not worth getting the Government involved. And then there are those of us who believe we have to find the best grassroots way we can to enable the American people to make a decent living for themselves and their children but to do it while preserving the heritage that God has given to Oregon, to the Pacific Northwest, and to our entire country, indeed, to our planet.

There are those who believe that all of our problems are personal and cultural. That is, if we would just get together and get our act together and do what is right and stop messing up, that we wouldn't have any problems in this old world. And there are others who believe that our problems are basically economic and political and the Government has to step in and do something.

Now, if you look at the Scouts, the VISTA, the MESA, all the groups that are here, what do all these groups do? What are all these young people doing? Why does national service work? Because we know at some level, unless people are raised with good values and unless they can take responsibility for themselves and do the right things and make the most of their own lives, there is nothing anyone else can do to give it to them. No one can give you a good life inside. No one can give you good values. No one can give you the discipline to do the right thing and—[*applause*]—you have to do that for yourself. So we all know that.

Let me tell you, I'm sure that no one would dispute me when I say that all of us have been given things in life that maybe we didn't even deserve. We've all been given a hand up from time to time. No person here today more than me knows that you do not achieve anything completely alone. So it is not either/or. We still need a country that cares about those of us who need a helping hand to do the right thing, who need a helping hand to make the most of their own lives, who need a sense of partnership to get through the difficult times that our country faces.

Now, over the next 3 or 4 months, you will see a lot of the things that we talked about here today debated in your Nation's Capital. And I want you to think about what I have said and what you have felt today. Should we balance the budget? Yes, we should. Why? Because there's a difference in borrowing money to invest in business or to finance your college education or to buy a home, and borrowing money just because

you want to go out to dinner at night. We've been borrowing money for both, and we've been so mixed up we couldn't tell the difference for too long. And as a result, we've been too dependent on other countries for funds. We have saved too little. We have invested too little. And we have had lower incomes because we have run ourselves into too much debt.

But there is a right way and a wrong way to balance the budget, because the Government's deficit is not the only problem in this country. There is also an education deficit in this country. There's a safe streets deficit in this country. There's an adequate affordable health care deficit in this country. There's a welfare reform deficit in this country. There are other deficits.

Our proposal to balance the budget says don't cut education because that's important to our future as well. If we want good jobs and higher incomes, we should increase our investment in education, from college loans to Head Start, while we balance the budget.

Our proposal says, of course we can't continue to increase health care expenditures at 2 and 3 times the rate of inflation; we have to slow it down. But be careful because there are a lot of people, the elderly, the disabled, the poorest children in our country, who depend upon Medicare and Medicaid for their medical care, and we dare not put them in a position to have to either give up health care or pay something they can't afford to pay when they don't have enough money to live on in the first place.

And so we say, yes, let's have big cuts in other things; let's balance the budget. But if you balance the budget in 10 years instead of 7, if you cut the size of the tax cuts and target them to middle class people for education and raising children and not just give tax cuts to people like me, who don't really need it, if you do that, you can balance the budget and increase our investment in education, be kind to the people who need health care help, from the smallest children to the disabled to elderly folks who don't have enough to live on, and still bring the American economy back and go into the 21st century with good jobs, higher incomes, and an educated citizenry, including all the little children in this audience today.

You know, we all have preconceptions, and sometimes preconceptions can be bad things. They can be stereotypes about people and places. I always had a preconception abut Oregon that I think has been confirmed by all my trips out here. I always felt that the people of Oregon had an astonishing ability to maintain their idealism and be practical, to be practical and idealistic at the same time. That's why we were pleased to give Oregon permission to get out from under all kinds of Federal rules and regulations, to change its welfare programs to move people to work, to change all kinds of other programs, because we knew this was a State where people had good values and common sense.

And so, I ask all of you join us in the fight to preserve education and balance the budget. Join us in the fight to develop the economy and preserve the environment. Join us in the fight to encourage people to be better citizens and to behave better and to have better values but also to give people who deserve it a helping hand and a hand up. In other words, keep your idealism intact. Bring your common sense to the table. Give power back to communities so that the young people here can have the kind of future, can have the kind of American dream that my generation took for granted.

The 21st century will be the most exciting time in all of human history, especially for the American people, if we can bring to the task today the compassion, the values, and the common sense that I believe is at the heart of what it means to be a citizen of this great State.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:10 p.m. in the Courtyard at Portland State University.

Executive Order 12965—Further Amendment to Executive Order No. 12852

June 27, 1995

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States and in order to extend the President's Council on Sustainable Development, it is hereby ordered that section 4(b) of Executive Order No. 12852, as amended, is fur-

ther amended by deleting "for a period of 2 years from the date of this order, unless the Council's charter is subsequently extended" and inserting in lieu thereof "until June 29, 1997, unless otherwise extended."

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 27, 1995.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 2:46 p.m., June 28, 1995]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 28, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on June 30.

Remarks on the Japan-United States Trade Agreement

June 28, 1995

Thank you very much, Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN], for that introduction. [*Laughter*]

Ladies and gentlemen, for 2½ years, I have worked hard to open markets and expand trade around the world for one simple reason: It is good for America. When we open new markets, millions of new consumers buy American products. And when we sell more American products, we create more American jobs. We created the largest market in the world with NAFTA. We passed GATT, the most comprehensive trade agreement ever.

The plain truth is, our products are now the best in the world, high quality, low cost. And our job here, and my job as President, is to make sure they can be sold fairly and freely throughout the world. That's how we create prosperity here at home.

One of the largest obstacles to free and fair trade has been the artificial barriers erected by Japan, especially around its auto and auto parts markets. For over 20 years, Presidents have tried to fix this problem without success. This unfair situation had to end.

After 20 months of negotiations, I ordered my Trade Representative, Ambassador Kantor, to impose sanctions on Japan unless they agreed to open these markets. Today Japan has agreed that it will begin to truly open its auto and auto parts markets to American companies.

This agreement is specific. It is measurable. It will achieve real, concrete results. And I have insisted on it from the start. In 1993, the Japanese and I agreed at our meeting in Japan on specific negotiating goals in the framework agreement. We have now achieved those goals. Now, through 2 years of steady and determined negotiations, we have done what we set out to do 2½ years ago.

Trade must be a two-way street. After 20 years, we finally have an agreement that will move cars and parts both ways between the United States and Japan. This breakthrough is a major step toward free trade throughout the world.

Japan will take specific steps that we expect will increase the number of dealers selling non-Japanese cars by 200 next year and 1,000 over the next 5 years. In the United States, 80 percent of our car dealers sell foreign cars right next to American cars. But in Japan, only 7 percent of car dealers sell American cars or any non-Japanese cars. That is unfair, and this agreement makes a strong start in fixing it.

Japan will begin to undo the rigid regulations of its market for repair parts. This agreement breaks the stranglehold Japanese manufacturers have had over repair shops and garages. It means more U.S. parts will be sold in Japan.

Finally, Japanese carmakers will expand their production in the United States and buy more American parts both here and in Japan. These measurable plans should increase purchases of American car parts by almost $9 billion in 3 years, a 50 percent increase. Japan is going to make half a million more new cars in the United States by 1998, an increase of 25 percent.

Sixty percent of our entire trade deficit with Japan is the result of a car and car parts deficit. This agreement helps to close the gap. This commitment means thousands of new jobs for American workers, jobs for Americans making parts sold to Japan, jobs for Americans making parts for Japanese cars manufactured here, jobs for Americans making American cars now sold in Japan, and jobs for Americans making Japanese models made in the United States, which will increase substantially in number over the next

few years. It is therefore a victory for our hardworking families. But make no mistake, it is also a victory for Japanese consumers, because it will mean lower prices for good products for them.

I want to commend the leaders of Japanese auto parts companies and auto companies and the leaders of the Japan Government for the courage and vision it took for them to reach this agreement. I personally want to thank Prime Minister Murayama and Minister Hashimoto for their leadership. And I especially want to thank Ambassador Mickey Kantor and his extraordinary team for the exhaustive efforts they have made to reach this successful conclusion.

In just a few moments, as soon as I conclude here, Ambassador Kantor and Minister Hashimoto will have a statement in detail about this agreement and will answer questions about it. I'm sure you can understand that they are in a better position to answer detailed questions than I am.

I had a long conversation with Ambassador Kantor about an hour ago, and I congratulated him.

I want all of you to understand that there is still much to be done. This agreement will not solve every problem in our relationship. But for today we have proved that hard bargaining and good faith can overcome apparently insurmountable conflict. This is important. And what it means is that sanctions are not necessary because we have achieved our goals. I am very proud of this negotiating team. I want to say that again. We set out a strategy, we held firm to our principles, and we achieved our goals. And those goals will lead to more jobs for Americans. Discipline at the negotiating table once again has proved that we can be successful.

And I want to say finally, again, this is a great victory for the American people. It is also a victory for the Japanese people. We both won. And as a result, the global economy and American jobs are better off.

Thank you.

Q. Is this a voluntary agreement, or are there any guarantees, Mr. President?

The President. Mr. Kantor will be speaking in just a moment, and he'll answer all the questions.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:20 p.m. in the Briefing Room at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ryutaro Hashimoto, Japanese Minister of International Trade and Industry.

Memorandum on the Combined Federal Campaign

June 28, 1995

Memorandum for the Heads of Executive Departments and Agencies

I am delighted that Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna Shalala has agreed to serve as the chair of the 1995 Combined Federal Campaign of the National Capital Area. I ask you to support the campaign by personally chairing it in your Agency and appointing a top official as your vice chair.

The Combined Federal Campaign is an important way for Federal employees to support thousands of worthy charities. This year our goal again is to raise more than $38 million. Public servants not only contribute to the campaign, but assume leadership roles to ensure its success.

Your personal support and enthusiasm will help guarantee another successful campaign this year.

William J. Clinton

Memorandum on Upgrading Security at Federal Facilities

June 28, 1995

Memorandum for Executive Departments and Agencies

Subject: Upgrading Security at Federal Facilities

I have received from the Department of Justice a study entitled, "Vulnerability Assessment of Federal Facilities." In order to ensure adequate security for Federal facilities, I am adopting immediately a number of the recommendations of the Department of Justice Study.

I hereby direct that:

1. Each Federal facility shall, where feasible, be upgraded to the minimum security standards recommended for its security level by the Department of Justice Study;

2. All executive departments and agencies ("agencies") shall immediately begin upgrading their facilities to meet the recommended minimum security standards, to the extent possible within currently available funding;

3. By October 15, 1995, the General Services Administration (GSA), those agencies with facilities in Security Level IV GSA space, and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) shall identify funding, no later than in the FY97 budget cycle, for the cost of upgrading Level IV facilities to the minimum security standards recommended by the Department of Justice Study;

4. By February 1, 1996, GSA and all agencies shall consult with OMB regarding funding mechanisms for upgrading all remaining Federal facilities to the minimum security standards recommended by the Department of Justice Study; and

5. All agencies shall adhere to the attached timetable for implementing this directive.

I also have directed OMB to review the remaining recommendations of the Department of Justice Study, and to advise me within 30 days from the date of this memorandum concerning the implementation of those recommendations.

William J. Clinton

Timetable for Upgrading Security at Federal Facilities

- All agencies shall immediately begin upgrading their facilities to meet recommended minimum security standards, to the extent possible within currently available funding—Immediate
- GSA shall establish Building Security committees for all Level IV GSA facilities—7/15/95
- GSA shall establish building Security Committees for all Level I–III GSA facilities—8/31/95
- Agencies with non-GSA space shall establish programs for upgrading their facilities to appropriate security standards—8/31/95
- Level IV Committees shall make requests to GSA for security upgrades to meet recommended minimum security standards—9/1/95
- GSA shall review and determine appropriateness of Level IV Committee requests; GSA shall advise Level IV tenant agencies of portion of approved requests that will be charged to their agencies through increased rents—10/1/95
- GSA, Level IV tenant agencies and OMB shall identify funding, no later than in the FY97 budget cycle, for the cost of upgrading security for Level IV facilities—10/15/95
- Level I–III Committees shall make requests to GSA for security upgrades to meet recommended minimum security standards—12/31/95
- GSA shall consult with Level I–III tenant agencies, and with OMB, regarding funding mechanisms for security upgrades—2/1/96
- Agencies with non-GSA space shall consult with OMB regarding funding mechanisms for security upgrades for their facilities—2/1/96

Letter to Congressional Leaders on the Plan to Balance the Budget

June 28, 1995

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Leader:)

We share the goal of balancing the federal budget, and I look forward to working with you on this important matter.

But as we work together to reach our shared goal, we must ensure that we do so the right way—the way that will raise the standards of living for average Americans.

My plan to balance the budget over 10 years will help raise average living standards by cutting unnecessary spending while investing in education and training, targeting tax relief to middle-income Americans, and taking incremental but serious steps toward health care reform. By contrast, the conference agreement cuts too deeply into Medicare and Medicaid and cuts education and training both to pay for a tax cut that is too large for too many who don't need it, and to meet the 7 year time frame.

Though I am determined to work with you to balance the budget, I cannot accept legislation that will threaten the living standards of American families.

I hope we can work together and avoid a situation in which I would have no choice but to use my veto authority broadly. The American people want us to work together to balance the budget and to do it the right way. I am ready to do that.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Newt Gingrich, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Bob Dole, Senate majority leader.

Message to the Senate Transmitting Documents on the Ukraine-United States Taxation Convention

June 28, 1995

To the Senate of the United States:

I transmit herewith an exchange of notes dated at Washington May 26 and June 6, 1995, for Senate advice and consent to ratification in connection with the Senate's consideration of the Convention Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Ukraine for the Avoidance of Double Taxation and the Prevention of Fiscal Evasion with Respect to Taxes on Income and Capital, together with a related Protocol, signed at Washington on March 4, 1994 (''the Taxation Convention''). Also transmitted for the information of the Senate is the report of the Department of State with respect to the exchange of notes.

This exchange of notes addresses the interaction between the Taxation Convention and other treaties that have tax provisions, including in particular the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS), annexed to the Agreement Establishing the World Trade Organization, done at Marrakesh April 15, 1994.

I recommend that the Senate give favorable consideration to this exchange of notes and give its advice and consent to ratification in connection with the Taxation Convention.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 28, 1995.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the Report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting

June 28, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 19(3) of the Public Telecommunications Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–356), I transmit herewith the report of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 28, 1995.

Remarks at a Democratic National Committee Fundraiser

June 28, 1995

Thank you very much, Chairman Fowler, for your introduction. Thank you, Congressman Clyburn, for being here tonight and for your leadership. I thank our friend Truman Arnold for his leadership of our finance efforts. I thank particularly Dan Dutko and Peter Knight and all others who raised funds for this important evening. This was the most successful DNC finance dinner ever, thanks to you. And we thank you for that.

I don't keep up with this too much, you know, because I have to spend most of my time being President, but I keep reading these stories that those of you who give to our party are threatened with your lives. If that's true, we appreciate the risk you took in being here. We'll try to make it worth your while for the future. You are living proof that there are a lot of Americans who want to do well themselves and to do good for themselves and for others, and we appreciate that.

I want to thank Senator Dodd. If he'd gotten any hotter tonight, he'd have set off the fire alarm. [*Laughter*] I hope America is listening.

I also want to thank you all for the response you gave when the mention of our agreement with Japan on autos and auto parts was mentioned. I thank you for that. It occurred in typically dramatic circumstances, going up to the eleventh hour. Last night I got home and sort of semi woke Hillary up about a quarter to 3 in the morn-

ing. I flew in from Portland, Oregon, where we had a wonderful economic conference yesterday on the five States of the Pacific Rim and their future in the 21st century. And I was being kind of kept up with a blow-by-blow description all the way on the airplane, going all the way on the across the country, about how we were doing with the Japanese and was it going to come apart or was it going to be put back together. And when I got off the plane in what was for us the middle of the night, I was told that it appeared that we were going to be able to do this, but I would still have to go to sleep, and they would wake me up at some point in the future if it all worked out. So this morning they woke me up, and I got to make the announcement that the agreement had been reached.

I start with that because I want to make a point. There are some people who say that our message is not clear or they don't know the difference between Republicans and Democrats. I can tell you one thing—there are two differences: One is, they may talk better but we do more, we do more. The other is, we try to do what we do in a way that benefits everybody, not just those who are going to do all right if we don't lift a finger anyway. And that makes a big difference.

This is not class warfare. I am proud of the fact that under our administration we've had more new businesses started and more new millionaires than at any previous point in American history. We want more and more people to do very well. But we want everyone to do well because the country is being lifted up, because we're growing the middle class, because we're shrinking the underclass. So we do things that are sometimes more difficult, because otherwise it won't work out that way.

And I want to talk to you about that tonight because when you leave here, if somebody asks you, what does it mean to be a Democrat in 1995, I want you to be able to give an answer. That's really important. It's really important. And if you look at this Japanese trade agreement, you will see one of the answers.

Now today, both parties say they're for free trade; but in 2½ years, we have negotiated 80 trade agreements, 15 with Japan. We're selling apples and rice and cellular telephones and now automobiles and auto parts to Japan. I'm proud of that.

There is no time in our history when we have had so much expansion of trade in such a short time. Why? Because we're living in a global economy. We have open markets. If we don't expand trade, we still get the downside, those countries that import into our country where their people are struggling to lift their own living standards and still working for wages our people can't live on. But when we open markets and we can sell high-quality, low-cost American products around the world, then we create jobs here that pay, on average, 15 percent above average wages in America. We give our people a way to promote the ideals of freedom and democracy and to do well while doing good.

But in order to do that, trade has to become increasingly more free and increasingly more fair. Therefore, when we negotiated the NAFTA agreement, we also wanted a commitment that we would make a long-term effort working together with Mexico and with Canada to protect the environment and to lift labor standards so that ordinary people in Mexico, as well as ordinary people in the United States, would do well if we expanded trade. That is the kind of thing that we try to do.

And we went to the brink with Japan because I know that the United States alone in the 21st century cannot lift the global economy. It will take a cooperation between the United States and Europe and Japan and all of those growing economies. We have to all work together. And I know that a trading system in Japan, which has made the nation fabulously wealthy but also, today, has brought it to the brink of financial trouble because their currency is so overvalued, because no one is investing in the country, their interest rates are almost negative now. And most important, ordinary people there are paying 40 percent more, 40 percent more than they ought to be paying, for consumer products. Those luxury cars we almost had to put tariffs on, made in Japan, cost 9,000 bucks more in Japan than in the United States. We cannot continue to work toward a global economy unless our great partner in Japan is also doing its part. And everything

I sought to do in opening their markets, I believe with all my heart, is not only good for our workers but for theirs.

But it's harder than just saying you're for free trade. You also have to be for fair arrangements that create jobs and grow incomes. That's what it means to be a Democrat in 1995. You've got to be for jobs and incomes and a fair global system.

You know, the Secretary of the Treasury and I and the Vice President—who is, by the way, in Russia tonight; and he's sorry that he and Tipper can't be here with Hillary and me, but he's doing very important work—we were in the Treasury Department the other day to announce one of our reinventing Government initiatives. And this initiative was about how businesses and individuals in 32 States next year are going to be able to file their taxes, State and Federal, at the same time electronically. And in the course of that, billions of dollars will be saved in compliance costs with the tax systems. And eventually, of course, we'll get to 50 States. But we're going to 32 next year.

And to illustrate this, we invited what I would call a real American, who happened to be in Washington for the White House Small Business Conference, to come and talk about how his circumstance would be changed. And the fellow we invited was a man named Paul Condit from west Texas, a John Deere dealer from west Texas. And old Paul Condit showed up with all of his papers that he was going to get to throw in the trashcan now that he could file electronically. And he looked at me—and this is why we're all here tonight—and he said, "Mr. President," he said, "you and the Vice President here have done a great job of reinventing Government. What you need to do now is reinvent communications because it ain't getting out in the heartland." And I think that's true.

Sometimes I feel like that old country song when I watch the evening news. Remember that country song that said, "They changed everything about me but my name"? [*Laughter*]

So tonight I want you to think about this: Why are you here? What will you do tomorrow? How do you intend to spend the next year to fulfill the mission that Senator Dodd and Chairman Fowler put before us tonight?

First, let's face facts. One of the reasons that our friends in the other party tend to do well is that they are great at giving simple answers to complicated questions. And this is a confusing time to people. Why shouldn't people be confused about public issues? They're confused about the way their own lives are working out in this world. It seems to be the best of times and the worst of times.

The good news: 6.7 million new jobs. I'm proud of that. The good news: record numbers of new businesses, record numbers of new millionaires. That's great. But how do you explain that fact that we drove down unemployment, drove up jobs, have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 30 years, have the lowest African-American unemployment in 20 years, and the median income in America has dropped by one percent in the last 2 years? And more and more people feel insecure in their own jobs with all the downsizing that's coming along.

So there is this ambivalence about the global economy. They say, "Hey, this is great, America creates jobs, but I may not get a raise." And more than half of the workers in this country are working for about the same wage they were making 10 years ago, and they're working a longer work week. And they're feeling more insecure.

And our Nation is the only one—they may criticize me until the cows come home for trying to do something about health care, Hillary and me, but I'll tell you one thing, we are the only country, the only one, where there are a smaller percentage of people today under the age of 65 with health insurance than there were 10 years ago. You'd be insecure, too, if that happened to you.

So, the good news and the bad news: crime. Look at crime. The crime rate is going down in almost every city in the country. And our crime bill will help it to go down further. But the crime rate is going up among very young teenagers; and random violence among our future citizens, going up.

I'll give you another example: technology. Technology is a blessing beyond all belief. I just was home, Hillary and I went home for 2 or 3 days, and I got to thinking about

it. A kid in a rural school district in the Ozark Mountains with only five or six people in the senior class can get on the Internet now and hook into a library in Australia and do a research paper on volcanoes, thanks to technology. Incredible! Utterly incredible!

But that same technology can expose that child's younger brother or sister to unbelievable pornography and can teach a deranged person who's smart enough to use a computer how to make a bomb, just like the one that blew up Oklahoma City. Technology means now that radical groups can develop little vials of sarin gas and walk into a subway in Japan and break it open and kill innocent people. It means other fanatic groups are now operating secret laboratories where they are searching for the ability to make biological warfare weapons, little germ warfare mechanisms that will kill people in the same sort of way.

So it's a good news/bad news story. After a while, people just get a headache and say, ''Just tell me a simple answer so I can go on with my life.'' So if somebody says, ''Well, vote for us. The Government's causing all your problems. We're for less Government, lower taxes. We'll be tough on crime, welfare, and immigration. We're your ticket.'' Sounds pretty good to me. ''We'll balance the budget. And you don't get anything out of the Government but an occasional audit and a bad regulation anyway.'' [*Laughter*] Sounds pretty good to me. Right? I mean, that's what we're dealing with. And then the whispered message is, besides that, ''Contribute enough, we'll let you write the legislation. We'll just kind of sit there in front for you.'' [*Laughter*] I think some of you are here tonight because you still want us to do some of the work. You don't have to do it all yourselves. [*Laughter*]

So it sounds good. What's wrong with it? First of all, for all the joking I'm saying, we are really—we're in a period of such profound change that we are being now asked by our people and forced by the press of events to debate fundamental questions. You heard Don Fowler stand up and say the Democratic Party rests on two principles; middle class economics and mainstream values is essentially what he said. We try to grow the middle class, help poor people work their way into the middle class. We try to offer a society in which people can come together, not be divided. You say that as if you take that for granted. That is not to be taken for granted any more.

Look what we're debating today in Washington: the first principles of what we are as a people, the first principles. And let me just give you some examples. We used to debate—from the end of the cold war until the last few years, we debated the difference between Republicans and Democrats in a range sort of like this. Now the range is about this big. All things are back on the table now. Why? The cold war is over. We don't have an organized rationale for how we relate to the rest of the world. And the global economy and the information age have all kinds of apparently conflicting impacts. It's confusing to people and all these questions are open. So let's go back to the basic questions, and when you walk out of here tonight, you'll either know why you're a Democrat or you'll be ready to switch. But at least it'll be a matter of principle, not convenience. Now, let's think about that.

Issue number one: There are now a lot of folks in this town—and Senator Dodd had a funny joke about it tonight: guns don't kill people, movies do—[*laughter*]—there are a lot of people here who believe that all of our problems are personal and cultural, as opposed to the old view that most of our common problems were economic and political. Now, if you think all of our problems are personal and cultural, that really lets you off the hook; you don't have to do much heavy lifting. You just say, ''Look, if everybody would just go out and behave and get up tomorrow and do the right thing, we wouldn't have any problems anyway,'' take your tax cut, and leave town. [*Laughter*] Think about it. If you believe that, if you believe that, you don't have to do much. You can spend all your time exhorting people to behave as individuals and attacking the influence centers in the culture who make movies you don't agree with or music you don't agree with or whatever.

Now, let me tell you what I think, and what I think has to be the credo of the Democratic Party. At a certain level, that is self-evidently true. That is, we know that there is nothing

Government can do for anybody they're not prepared to do for themselves. If people will not take responsibility for their own lives, for their children, for their education, for making the most of their own lives, there's nothing we can do. That is self-evidently true. There's not a single soul here tonight who can afford the price of a ticket to be here because somebody just gave you something. You all had to do something back. That's what the Democratic Party was founded on, hard work. And at a certain level, we all know that there are influence centers in our culture, entertainment, sports, the media, business, labor, you name it, that are beyond government and politics. That's true, too.

I'd like you to remember, however, that some of us were raising questions about this long before the Presidential election started. Tipper Gore, 18 years ago, was talking about whether lyrics in music were good for children and how we should discuss this. I was dealing with these issues with Hillary long before I ever thought I was running for President. This should not be an issue for a political season. But that's true. But you know what? If you use that as an excuse to walk away, then you don't have to vote for the family and medical leave law. Let me tell you something, it's a lot easier to be a good person and a good parent if you don't lose your job when you have to go home when your baby is born and your parent is sick. So there are political and economic issues here, as well.

And all those people that came home from World War II, that built the greatest middle class the world had ever known, they did it because they were great patriots and good parents and good workers. And they were good citizens. They also did it because they had the GI bill.

So don't let anybody tell you—the first thing I would tell you is, I believe if you're a Democrat, you don't agree that all of our problems are exclusively personal and cultural, you think there are economic and political dimensions to the challenges we face, and you don't want to take a dive on it.

The second issue flows out of the first. What about the role of Government? What is the role of Government? If you believe that all the problems are personal and cultural, then the role of Government is fund the defense, balance the budget as quick as you can, consistent with giving a big tax cut.

But if you believe that the role of Government is to help people make the most of their own lives and that in every age and time we have common challenges that can best be met in this way, then that changes everything. Then you say, "Yes, well, we ought to balance the budget, but guess what, there's an education deficit, too. And I don't want to cut off my nose to spite my face. And I don't believe that we should give tax cuts unless it will grow the economy and raise incomes, unless people need it, unless it supports education, unless it supports the economic challenges we face. So let's balance the budget in a way that increases investment in our people so that we get both benefits, a balanced budget and helping people make the most of their own lives, because the objective is to raise incomes and bring the American people together."

I'll give you another example. Look at the crime debate. If you believe all the problems are personal and cultural, then you couldn't possibly support the Brady bill or the assault weapons ban because that represents a minor inconvenience to the law-abiding people who for whatever reason want an assault weapon or the far larger number of law-abiding people who genuinely want to buy handguns and are somehow discomforted if they have to wait a few days while there's a background check. Because if all the problems are personal and cultural, just catch the wrongdoers, throw them in jail, throw the key away, and forget about it.

But if you live in the real world instead of the world of ideological extremes, and you think—[*applause*]—and you think that some of our problems are political and that we have an obligation to work together, then you say, well, a law-abiding person who wants to buy a handgun really won't object to this minor inconvenience to help a few more police officers and a few more innocent children stay alive. You say to yourself that law-abiding people will find other ways to satisfy their desire for sporting activities with guns, even if they have to give up these assault weapons so we can get the Uzis out of the

high schools. That's the kind of thing you say to yourself.

Now, this has—I submit to you, this has nothing to do with the right to keep and bear arms—nothing, nothing. This has to do with whether you think our problems are just isolated personal things or bad culture, or whether you believe that we have to band together, to work together to find practical solutions to solve our problems.

Now, all the law enforcement people say, ''We live with this problem, and it's not just as simple as locking people up and throwing away the key. Punishment is important. Please punish bad people. But meanwhile, please pass the Brady bill. Please pass the assault weapons ban. Please spend some money on prevention so our kids have something to say yes to as well as something to say no to.'' That's what people in law enforcement say who live with this every day. Why? Because they know that our problems are both personal and cultural and they are political and economic and social. And if we don't pull together and try to solve them, we will never make much progress. We'll just have a lot of elections with hot air, 30-second ads, driving people's emotion through the roof but never really getting down to the business of moving America forward. So I say if you're a Democrat, you say it is both, not one.

Let me just give you one final example. Look at the environment—look at the environment. Look what has happened. We even had a subcommittee the other day vote to lift the ban on all offshore oil drilling. ''Never mind how small the proven reserves are, never mind what it would do to the retirees or the tourists in Florida or California, or never mind what might happen off the New Jersey coast. Government is bad; what is private is good. If somebody can get up enough money to sink an oilwell anywhere in this country offshore, let them do it. And even if there are unfortunate consequences, we are philosophically opposed to doing anything that would interfere with that.'' These are the people that want to let all the environmental law be rewritten by those who want to get rid of them. And they're doing a pretty good job of that. Now, but to be fair to them, that's the way they think. In other words, they think it's a nice enough thing if you can preserve the environment, but not if the price of preserving the environment, God forbid, is having Government pass a law.

This is the debate that's going on. You laugh. Don't tell me you don't know the difference between our party and the other party. This is the debate that is going on in Washington. But let's be fair to them. They honestly believe that it is wrong for the Government to protect our common heritage because the Government would mess up a one-car parade; the Government might interfere with something someone wants to do to make a dollar in the short run; and the Government, being a fallible institution, will mess up now and again and do really dumb things. Now this is a first principle.

I say to you, any institution comprised of human beings will err. And Government should be restrained because it has power. And that's why we've got the Constitution we've got. But I'll say this too: Unless we preserve our fundamental natural environment and find a way to grow the economy while protecting the environment, then our grandchildren and their grandchildren will not know the America that we have grown up in and come to love.

And again—so you want to know what the difference is? I believe the purpose of Government is to help people to make the most of their own lives. I believe the purpose of Government is to grow the economy in ways that creates more entrepreneurs and more millionaires but also raises incomes for the middle class and shrinks the under class. I believe our business here is to find a way to solve our problems in practical ways that bring us together and don't drive us apart. I believe ideological extremism is the bane of America's progress. It has been for 200 years, and it still is. We cannot put political correctness ahead of advancing the lives of the American people. That's what I believe.

You know, you take every single one of the other party's themes—they say, ''We want less Government.'' Sounds great. Our party, our administration, 2½ years, has reduced the size of the Federal Government by 150,000. If we don't pass another budget, we'll still have the smallest Government we've had since President Kennedy was in

office. But you know what? I also know that downsizing, while it is necessary, is threatening to real people. And so look how we did it. We didn't just throw people in the street. We gave them good early retirement incentives. We tried to take time to do this in a reasoned way, because there are people involved and there are practical realities involved.

I want to cut the size of Government. I want to cut regulation. The other day we cut 16,000 regulations at the White House Conference on Small Business. They want to get rid of the Department of Commerce. Why? Because ideologically the Government obviously can never do anything to help the private sector. Never mind the fact that Ron Brown has created more jobs in the private sector than any Secretary of Commerce in history with the partnerships and the efforts that have been made.

I could go on and on and on. But if you strip apart, take it all away, you see an honest, huge debate. They say all of our problems are personal and cultural; private is good, public is bad; balance the budget as quickly as possible; give the biggest tax cut you can; don't worry about anything but defense. We say in the post-cold-war world of the global economy in the 21st century, the most important thing is whether people can make the most of their own lives, whether they can compete and win in the global economy, and whether we can do it in a way that keeps the American dream alive, where more people are moving into the middle class, where people are rewarded for their efforts, and where we find a way to make our diversity a strength, not a weakness. That is the difference. That is enough difference for me to stand on until kingdom come. I am proud to be here with the Democratic Party tonight, and I hope you are, too.

Now, let me say these two brief points in closing. First of all, I have said this so that you would know where I stand and so you could help to determine where you stand. But that does not mean that I believe we would be better off if we were more partisan. I think the American people are sick of partisanship, just for the sake of partisanship.

The other night I was out in San Francisco—I want to tell you this story. And I'll tell you—because I want you to think about this. I think these people are pretty representative of our country. And I saw a couple about my age having dinner, and they said, "Mr. President, would you come shake hands with us?" So I did. And even though they were about my age, they told me they were celebrating their first anniversary—celebrating their first anniversary. And I said, "Well, Hillary and I are about to celebrate our 20th anniversary." And it was—you know, people will sometimes tell you anything when you're President. So this man in this very touching—this man said—this man got this sort of faraway look in his eye, and he said, "You know, I'd be celebrating my 20th anniversary, too, this year, but my wife passed away, and I met this wonderful woman." And then the woman smiled, and she said, "My husband didn't pass away. He was a jerk." [*Laughter*] And she said—it's a true story—and she said, "And I met this wonderful man." [*Laughter*] And then they—I couldn't believe this. I'm just standing here, you know, listening to this. [*Laughter*] This is America. This is not Washington, DC, now. [*Laughter*] Then they go on—this is America. So then, then they go on to tell me that he is a Republican, and she is a Democrat; that he owns a fast food restaurant chain, and she's a school teacher; that she voted for me, and he didn't. They tell me all this in about 5 minutes. I'm listening to this whole thing. [*Laughter*] But let me tell you what they said. Here's the point I want to make. Here's the point I want to make. They were just out there in San Francisco, and they didn't live in California. They were out there celebrating their first anniversary. And he said to me—he said, and she said amen—he said, "You know, we come from different parties. We look at a lot of things in different ways, but we think what happened to Dr. Foster was a crying shame." That's what they said. And they said—[*applause*]—and they said, "We just think there's too much partisanship in Washington."

So let me tell you what I'm trying to do. That's why I went to that wonderful little town in New Hampshire where Hillary and I fell in love with the folks in 1992 and had that conversation with the Speaker of the

House. A lot of people said, "This is crazy, don't do it," whatever. I decided that it would be better to try to honestly tell the American people what the real differences are and then see if there is some honest way we can bridge those differences to move forward. That's what I decided we ought to do, because I believe that the American people will listen and think with their heads and their hearts, with their ears open instead of being all torn up and upset by their genuine confusion and uncertainty about the future. We will do fine, because most people run the rest of their lives the way we believe our country ought to be run.

And the only reason that things seem so out of whack today is that everything is changing and people are confused and uncertain, so they are vulnerable to easy answers to complex problems. And what we have to say is, when you hear all this stuff, will it raise incomes? Will it generate jobs? Will it bring people together? Will it make us a stronger country? Will it bring us into the future in better shape? So when we ask ourselves how should we balance the budget, I say if it takes a little longer and you have to have a little smaller tax cut, if you can take care of all these old folks on Medicare and you can increase education instead of cut it, let's do that, because that is the kind of America that we ought to have. That is the kind of America that we ought to have.

What I want to say to you is that I am now convinced that we have an enormous opportunity if we can be clear and unambiguous. We don't have to even attack. We just need to try to honestly explain. I have tried tonight to honestly explain to you where I believe many of them are on their issues and where we are. I have tried to be as honest as I could. But we have an opportunity here. Oklahoma City, as tragic and awful as it was, took a lot of the meanness out of this country. It made us all think again about what it is that we share as human beings across all the divides. And when Captain O'Grady survived those 6 days in Bosnia and came home, it gave a little lift back to our country, and it made us think about all the things we're proud of about America, that brings us together across all the divides.

And I leave you with this: The Democrats—the Democrats believe that we're here to help each other make the most of our own lives, that there will never be a time when Government can do anything for people they won't do for themselves, but that it is simply an evasion of our common responsibility to say our problems are only personal problems, only cultural problems. And it is self-defeating to believe we can move into the 21st century without finding a way to go there together—to go there together.

This is a very great country. And the American people are now listening and looking. And we have an opportunity to be what we are. We are not negative. We are not wreckers. We are builders. Do not run away from that because of the power of the negative forces of recent years. Instead, embrace it. Go out and tell people what you believe, why you believe it, and why we ought to be returned in 1996, not for our sake but for the future of our country.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 9:50 p.m. at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Donald L. Fowler, chairman, Democratic National Committee.

Remarks Announcing Community Policing Grants

June 29, 1995

Thank you. Commissioner, I need this around here these days. [*Laughter*] I'm delighted to have it. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Madam Attorney General. I thank all the law enforcement officials who are here, the representatives of the victims group, Mrs. Brady, and the others who have supported and led the fight for the passage of the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban. We're glad to see the mayors here: Mayor Giuliani, Mayor Cleaver, Mayor Barry, and others. And I thank the Members of Congress for coming: Senators Biden and Boxer and Pell, and Congressman LaFalce, Congresswoman Maloney, Congressman Schumer, Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton, and I think Congressman Kennedy is here, Congresswoman Harman. I miss anybody? I want to thank all of them, you know,

because if it hadn't been for them—and especially I thank you, Senator Biden, for making sure we actually got this crime bill passed last year through all the political fog and the 6 years of debate.

I want to say this is a day—I was thinking—on the way in we had a little television out here in the anteroom, and we were watching the American and the Russian spaceships who are hooking up in space. And they were going back and forth and kind of playing games with each other in space, and I said, ''Well, I guess this really means the cold war is over.'' It's a source of celebration. Today, as this is going on, the Vice President is in Moscow talking with Prime Minister Chernomyrdin about a whole range of issues between our country.

Yesterday we celebrated what I believe is a very, very strong trade agreement with Japan that will create jobs for American workers. And I feel good about that. And I think in so many ways the United States is taking full advantage of this global society of ours, of the end of the cold war. Of course, there are still problems; there will be problems until the end of time. But in so many ways, we're taking full advantage of it. And yet, I think one of the things that all of us has to recognize, all of us who love our country and want the best for it, is that we must find ways for the American people to feel more secure as they move into a world that is changing more and more.

Part of it is economic security. We have to find ways not only to create jobs but to raise people's incomes and to give them a better chance to either keep the job they've got or to know they can get another one if they have to lose it in this wave of downsizing that's sweeping the entire world. And a lot of it is what you do. It's what you have to do every day. The first responsibility any of us have in public life is to preserve order and law and security.

When I ran for President, I had the opportunity to travel all over this country and visit with police officers and walk the streets of our largest cities and some of our small towns and talk to people about crime and drugs and what was happening to young people and the rising tide of violence in our country. And I pledged at that time that if I were elected, I would do everything I could to put another 100,000 police officers on the street and to pay for it by reducing the size of the Federal Government by 100,000.

The Congress has voted already to reduce the size of the Federal Government by 272,000. And I can report to you that today we're over halfway there. There are 150,000 fewer people working for this Government today than there were on the day I took the oath of office as President. We have done it in what I think is a very humane way. We had packages to give people incentives for early retirement. We've tried not to be guilty of cruel downsizing. And we've tried not to forget that those people served our country and served our country well.

But we need to reallocate the resources from the Federal Government to the streets of America to increase the sense of security people have. And I feel very, very strongly that this has worked because of all of you and because of people like you around the country. The crime bill and the COPS MORE Program, in particular, are running on time, as the Attorney General said, and ahead of schedule, and in fact, we're slightly even under budget. I hesitate to say that because someone will find a way to get us up over it before you know it. [*Laughter*]

This partnership really works. We give communities the resources that they need to put more police officers on the streets. Communities, in return, take responsibility to train and deploy those officers. In turn, the officers help ordinary citizens to find the commitment and the courage to do their part to fight against crime. That is the genius of community policing. It's a fight for the habits of our lives and the habits of our heart.

We can't make our streets truly safe until everybody really is committed to doing their part, until you have the help you need from parents and teachers and friends and neighbors and from the role models that young people look up to, from actors, athletes, and others. Our responsibilities, of course, have to begin with our children.

The evidence suggests today that you are making a lot of headway with the resources that your folks are giving you at the local level and with the crime bill. And I'm encouraged by that. In almost every major city in the

country, the crime rate is down. In many major areas, the crime rate is down dramatically. In many smaller and medium sized cities, the crime rate is down.

But we cannot be too optimistic because there are some troubling signs. First of all, in some major areas where the crime rate has gone down because you've been able to deploy more police resources, the crime rate has shifted into areas that aren't as well organized and aren't as well prepared for it. That's one of the reasons that, when the Congress passed the crime bill, they said we had to deploy these resources fairly and evenly across the country, not just in the bigger areas but in the smaller ones as well, because they knew this would happen. And sure enough, it has in some places.

The other thing I want to point out is that even though the overall crime rate has gone down, the rate of random violence among young teenagers is going up. And I might say—I'm concerned about it—that the rate of casual drug use among teenagers is going up, even as the Justice Department has had unparalleled success in breaking big drug gangs and interrupting big drug sales and doing things that are a cause for great celebration. There is this troubling undertow because so many of our kids are still getting in trouble out there. And it's something we need to face.

And I think it is a product, in part, of the chaos of modern times, from the breakdown of the family to the breakdown of order on the streets. And again I say, we have to find a way to take advantage of all these dramatic changes, which make us want to stay glued to the TV and watch the spaceships connect, which make us want to have free but fair trade with Japan and all other countries so all of us can benefit from that, but which have also brought so much disruption to the lives of Americans all over our country.

That's really what this is about. And it's going to require some level of contribution by every citizen. You know, I have listened to this debate, for example, over the Brady bill and over the assault weapons ban, from now to kingdom come. I could close my eyes and give you both sides of it in excruciating detail. But the truth is, it doesn't have anything to do with the right to keep and bear arms. It really has more to do with the way you view what it means to be an American in 1995. That is, some of our people really believe that the only problems we have in this country are personal misconduct and bad cultural trends, and if everybody would just shape up and behave, we'd be fine.

Well, at one level that's true, isn't it? I mean, it's self-evidently true. And it's something we shouldn't minimize because nothing we can do, any of us, will really have any impact on the lives of our people unless more people do the right thing. But to pretend that there are no actions we can take as a people in common that will make a difference is pure folly.

And a lot of the people that object to the Brady bill and the assault weapons ban are people who say things like, "Well, I'm not a criminal. I ought to have a right to have any kind of weapon I want, and I ought not to have to wait 5 minutes for it, much less 5 days. Just punish wrongdoers. Put them in jail. Throw away the key." But that ignores the fact that we have common responsibilities. And you see this running through every single contentious debate. "Why should I wear a helmet when I get on my motorcycle? I'm not going to do anything dumb," or "If I want to, if I want to put myself in danger, I ought to have the right to do it. Never mind what it does to the health care system. Never mind how it might traumatize somebody who might hit me by accident and paralyze me for life."

You see, this is the debate that's going on in our country all the time. And it's a big deal now. There's a huge number of people who believe that since all problems are purely personal or cultural, we don't have any common obligations. This is not a Republican-Democratic deal. It's not a liberal or conservative deal. It is really a—we're back to debating first principles in our country.

And those of you who are in law enforcement, you can really help, because almost all Americans really respect you for what you do. They know you put lives on the line. They know you stick your necks out. They know you're doing something that you'll never get rich doing because you believe that it's the right thing to do.

And you need to take every opportunity you can to say, ''Hey, you know, that's right. We need to punish wrongdoers. And we need to tell everybody to do the right thing, but there are things we can do in common that make a difference. And frankly, everybody who wants a handgun who's a law-abiding citizen ought to be willing to be put out the minor inconvenience it takes to wait a while so we can check and find the others who aren't.''

You know, it is a small price to pay for being an American citizen living in the greatest country in the world and making a few more people safe. And people who are interested in sporting weapons ought to be willing to give up these assault weapons to get the Uzis out of the high schools. It is a small price to pay for living in the greatest country in the world and recognizing that we all have common responsibilities. We just don't all get to have our way simply because we're law-abiding.

Now, that is the debate that's going on in this country today. And that's why this community policing is so important. It is a small price to pay to prevent things from going wrong so we don't have to punish even more kids who might have been more law-abiding had community policing been there in the first place. Yes, it's true that you also catch criminals quicker, but the real genius of community policing is that over the long run it helps to prevent crime. But it only works if we have a common decision to do something in common as a people.

I cannot tell you how important I think this is. And of course, these problems have a very human face. Tomorrow I'm going to Chicago to honor one officer named Daniel Doffyn who was killed in the line of duty by a TEK–9, an assault weapon banned now by the assault weapons ban. I realize there may be some people out there who would like to have had these weapons. They're still better off being in America, and they can still have a whole arsenal in their homes, and it is a minor price to pay to be an American at this time facing our problems.

You know, if we had mass starvation in this country because we couldn't grow enough food, we could all say, ''Well, everybody should be more responsible,'' but we'd find some common response to that. When they have an earthquake in California, everybody wants to go help them because we know that requires a common response. We have to start thinking about our persistent problems in this same way. That is really the fundamental debate we're having here in Washington today, goes way beyond partisan politics to how we are going to live as a people.

And so I would say to you that—I'll give you another example, and this is controversial. A lot of people in my party and a lot of my friends don't agree with this. I think the Supreme Court did the right thing this week by upholding the right of schools to do drug testing on student athletes—I don't—because drug use is going up. Now, I believe that not because I think we should assume that kids are using drugs—most kids are good kids, and they've got enough problems as it is without us looking down on them—not because I don't think they're entitled to their constitutional rights but because we know as an objective fact that casual drug use is going up among young people again. And it's wrong. It's crazy. It's not just illegal, it is dangerous for them.

And you know, you don't have a right to be on the football team or the basketball team or in the band or do anything else. So I think it's like the Brady bill. It's like, ''Look, this is a hassle for you. We're asking you to do this for your country. We're not assuming you're a drug user. We're asking you to do this for your country. Do this because we need our kids to be drug-free.''

And so, I'm proud of all of you. I am proud to be a part of this. I am proud that we are doing this today, and I am proud we've got over 20,000 police officers. And we're on time; we're actually a little ahead of schedule.

But I want you to go home and realize that this community policing debate and this debate about the assault weapons and this debate about the Brady bill is part of a huge, huge question that is now the dominant question every time they go to the floor to vote in the Congress on a controversial bill; this issue is behind almost every one of them. Because our problems at one level are personal and cultural, but they are also common: they are political; they are economic; they

are social. And what we have to do is to find the right balance.

And we cannot, any of us, go off in some sanctimonious huff, saying that just because we don't do anything wrong, we shouldn't be asked to contribute to our country. And I'm not just talking about paying taxes. Whether it's obeying the speed limit or wearing a helmet or obeying these gun laws, we all ought to recognize that what—we have to define the challenges of America at this time.

And one of the biggest challenges is to make the American people feel more secure in a time of very rapid change. There is more opportunity out there for our people than ever before. But a lot of Americans are scared to death, for economic reasons and because of crime problems and other things. You, you are making a huge difference to them.

But when people see you with your uniforms, when they see you with these badges, then all these theoretical debates become very real. They know what you are. They know who you are. They know you're sticking up for them.

And the more you can make the community policing program work, the more you can make people understand that you're not trying to take their liberties away by asking them to wait to check on the handguns ownership or by dealing with the assault weapons ban, the more we can bring the American people back into a consensus again that we have more personal liberty in this country than any other democracy in the world but that all of us have to pay a price to maintain our liberties, to maintain our freedom, to meet the challenges of this day.

And frankly, when you look at it clear-headedly, it is a very small price indeed for the benefit of taking this country into the 21st century still the strongest country in the world. That's what the community policing is all about; that's what the Brady law is about; it's what the assault weapons ban is all about; it's what testing those kids in that school district is all about, for drugs; it's what a lot of these controversial issues we're trying to deal with are all about.

So I ask you to go home and tell your folks that we want to preserve our liberties, we want to preserve our freedom, we want to enhance their security, but they have to make some modest contributions to this as well. That's what you're doing, and that's what we have to do.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:33 a.m. in Room 450 of the Old Executive Office Building. In his remarks, he referred to R. Gil Kerlikowske, Buffalo, NY, police commissioner who presented the President with a Buffalo City Police Department shield; Mayor Rudolph Giuliani of New York City; Mayor Emanuel Cleaver II of Kansas City, MO; and Mayor Marion Barry of Washington, DC.

Statement on the Observance of Independence Day, 1995

June 29, 1995

I am delighted to join my fellow Americans in celebrating Independence Day.

Commemorating the birth of the greatest democracy in the world, the Fourth of July is a testament to all that is unique about America. Born of the courage of our founders and sustained by the spirit and sacrifice of every generation since, our nation has built a proud legacy of liberty. On this day, millions of our citizens join friends and loved ones at picnics and parades to rejoice in the blessings of freedom. People of all backgrounds unite in celebrating the energy and optimism that have always defined us as a people.

We are blessed that our country is better able than any other to face the trials and embrace the opportunities of the next century. Holding fast to the noble principles on which America was founded, we must look toward tomorrow with the same love of freedom, faith in justice, and firm commitment to moving forward together. These ideals, which have seen us through more than two centuries of challenge and change, will bring us ever closer to a future of hope, prosperity, and peace.

Best wishes to all for a wonderful celebration.

Bill Clinton

NOTE: An identical message was also made available by the White House.

Statement on the Supreme Court Decision on the Georgia Congressional Redistricting Case

June 29, 1995

I am disappointed by the Supreme Court decision in the Georgia congressional redistricting case. The decision is a setback in the struggle to ensure that all Americans participate fully in the electoral process, and it threatens to undermine the promise of the Voting Rights Act.

My administration remains firmly committed to full enforcement of the Voting Rights Act. We will continue working to ensure that minority citizens in racially polarized areas have an effective remedy against the unlawful dilution of their votes and against impairment of their ability to participate in the electoral process. Congress, on a bipartisan basis, passed the Voting Rights Act to fulfill the constitutional guarantees of full political rights for all citizens, regardless of race. The Justice Department will continue its vigorous enforcement of the law.

We have traveled a long road to fulfill the promise of political rights for all citizens. Today is a difficult day on that journey, but the road does not end here. While the ruling in the Georgia case is unfortunate, I am gratified that the Court's statements and actions make clear that race properly may be considered in the drawing of legislative districts.

Despite today's setback, we will not let this decision turn back the clock. We will not abandon those citizens who look to the Voting Rights Act to protect their constitutional rights.

Statement on Agreement With Congress on Budget Rescissions Legislation

June 29, 1995

I am pleased that we have reached an agreement with Republicans and Democrats in the Congress on the rescissions bill.

I vetoed the original rescissions bill because it reduced the deficit the wrong way. The new bill achieves the same amount of deficit reduction as the previous bill, but it does so the right way, by protecting investments in children, education, national service, job training, and the environment that Congress wanted to cut. These are the kind of balanced priorities that make sense for our country as we enter the difficult budget debates ahead.

Specifically, the new legislation restores $733 million in these critical areas, including $220 million for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, $60 million for training teachers and other reforms under Goals 2000, $105 million for AmeriCorps, and $225 million for the safe drinking water program.

Like the original bill, the legislation contains over $16 billion in spending cuts, and it provides supplemental funds I requested for disaster relief activities of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Federal response to the bombing in Oklahoma City, increased antiterrorism efforts, and debt relief to Jordan to facilitate progress toward a Middle East peace settlement.

We have now achieved a bill that I am prepared to sign. This is essential legislation, and I hope the Congress will act on it quickly. While on balance I believe we made such significant changes that I am able to sign the legislation, the bill does contain provisions I do not support.

I still do not believe this bill should contain any of the provisions relating to timber. I opposed the timber salvage rider because I believe that it threatens once again to lead to legal gridlock and to impair, rather than promote, sustainable economic activity. I continue to have that concern. But the conferees did accept important changes in the language that preserve our ability to implement the current forest plans and their standards and to protect other resources such as clean water and fisheries.

Furthermore, Chairman Hatfield insists that the timber salvage provisions provide complete discretion for the administration to implement these provisions according to our best judgment.

I take Senator Hatfield at his word. Therefore, after signing the rescissions bill into law, I will direct the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and all other Federal agencies to carry out timber salvage activities consistent with the spirit and intent

of our forest plans and all existing environmental laws.

We will abide by the balanced goals of our forest plans, and we will not violate our environmental standards. Both are too important to protecting our quality of life and our economy.

Message to the Congress on District of Columbia Budget Legislation

June 29, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 446 of the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act, I am transmitting the District of Columbia's Proposed FY 1995 Second Supplemental Budget and Rescissions of Authority Request Act and the Proposed FY 1996 Budget Request Act.

The Proposed FY 1996 Budget has not been reviewed or approved by the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, created by Public Law 104–8, the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Act of 1995 (the "Act"). It will be subject to such review and approval pursuant to section 208 of the Act.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 29, 1995.

Remarks at a Fundraiser in Chicago, Illinois

June 29, 1995

Thank you very much. Mr. Mayor, thank you for your introduction, your support, the power of your leadership. Thank you, Bill Daley, for being willing to leave Chicago and come to Washington, which is prima facie evidence of some loss of sanity—[*laughter*]—to help us pass NAFTA. And thank you for your long friendship and your support.

Thank you, Father Wall, for getting us off on the right start. Maybe we'll be a little less partisan, a little less like the Republicans tonight since you prayed over us to start. I thank you all for being here and for your support.

When Hillary was making her remarks I was looking at her, imagining her here, thinking about the first time I ever came to Chicago to see my wife, before we were married. I believe I was in her house 3 hours before her father came down and said hello to me. [*Laughter*] It was sort of like running for President; you just can't get discouraged; you have to keep going and—[*laughter*]—you're laughing, but that's the truth, that story I'm telling. [*Laughter*] And I owe so much to this city and to this State.

Last Saturday I was home in Arkansas, in a little town called Pine Bluff. I took Dr. Henry Foster back there because he was born there, he grew up there. And that's still a place where people judge you by what you do instead of what you say. And I think we'd be better off if the rest of America were more like that. But anyway, we went home to Pine Bluff. And while we were there, it turned out that in this baseball park four blocks from where Henry Foster was born and where he learned to play baseball, there was a phenomenal amateur baseball tournament going on with all the major amateur leagues there in a playoff. And it was on ESPN. And two of the players were drafted right out there to the majors. And I went to throw out the first pitch, since I was there. And I was interviewed by none other than Gary "The Sarge" Matthews. You all remember him. He took the Cubs to one of those playoffs. So he said to me, "Now, come on, Mr. President, who's your favorite baseball team?" I said, "When I married my wife, I inherited two things, a wonderful family of in-laws and the Chicago Cubs." And I expect to get lots of mail. After I met the Daleys, I got to go to White Sox games, which made me feel very good about that.

On the wall of my private little office in the White House, just off of the Oval Office, I have one of my most treasured pictures, a picture of Hillary and me on March 17th, Saint Patrick's Day, 1992, in the confetti in Chicago on the night that we won the Democratic primary in Illinois and virtually assured the nomination victory. And for all of that, I thank you all very, very much.

Since then this administration has had a remarkable partnership with this State and with this city, in the ways that the mayor mentioned, fighting for the crime bill, bringing the Democratic Convention here, Chicago winning a fair and open contest to be one of the six cities in America to get one of our empowerment zones, to prove that we can have a partnership between Government and the private sector to rebuild to poorest parts of America and give people opportunity and free enterprise again in every part of the country. And I congratulate Chicago on that.

I have strongly supported the mayor's efforts at school reform, something that I care desperately about. If we cannot make our schools work, we're going to have a very hard time prevailing in the 21st century with the American dream. And you know, over 90 percent of all the funds for education in America come from the State and local government. We can do some things at the national level. And our Secretary of Education, Dick Riley, has done a great job. But unless there are people at the grassroots who are committed to making the schools work so that children learn, they learn things they need to know, they are useful, they are effective, we are going to have a very difficult time. There is no more important battle, and I congratulate him on waging that battle.

And finally, I'd like to say a word of appreciation to the city for being willing to work with us in good faith through Secretary Cisneros and the Department of Housing and Urban Development in an attempt to reform and really improve the Chicago public housing. We are committed to that. The mayor is committed to that. We are going to prove some things that most people in America don't think can be done. And we are going to do it right here in Chicago, thanks to you. And we appreciate you for that.

And we are very much looking forward to being here for the convention. Debra DeLee is here. We've all got our feet on the ground. It was David Wilhelm's parting gift to his neighbor State before he left the Democratic Party in Washington with our strong support.

I thank the mayor for what he said about the things that we had done. I just want to say one word about that. I've done a lot of things that were controversial in this last 2½ years. But I haven't done anything that I didn't think was right for America. What I'm trying to do is to test the outer limits of our leadership, I think. But I think that's important at a time of profound change. But I'm trying to learn the balance, you know, like the mayor said, balancing the budget in 10 years instead of 7. I want to talk more about the other day—that in a minute.

But I heard a story the other day about the limits of leadership, which I think about now before I do something really controversial, about the famous Louisiana Governor and later Senator, Huey Long, who as some of you know was a very great politician and was Franklin Roosevelt's chief rival for the affections of the Democratic Party before he was assassinated in the early thirties. And when Huey Long was a Governor, one day he was out on a country crossroads in the depths of the Depression where people had no money, nothing, no jobs. It was terrible, particularly in our part of the country.

And he had a big crowd of people out there in the country. And he started giving a speech. And his whole platform was share the wealth, you know, nobody had very much money, and we ought to share what we had. So he looked at this crowd of people, these poor people and farmers in the country, and he said, "You know, we have got to share the wealth." And he spotted a farmer that he knew out in the crowd. And he said, "Farmer Jones, if you had three Cadillacs, wouldn't you give up one of them so we could drive it around here in the county and pick up all the kids and take them to school during the week and take them to church on Sunday?" He said, "Of course I would." He said, "And if you had $3 million, wouldn't you give up a million dollars so we could put a roof on everybody's house and feed all the children in this country?" He said, "Of course I would." He said, "And if you had three hogs——" And the farmer said, "Now, wait a minute, Governor. I've got three hogs." [*Laughter*] So I'm trying to learn what the limits of leadership are.

This has been a good day for America. We're celebrating the trade agreement with Japan, which all of you were kind enough to applaud. I want to tell you a little about

it. It is different from and better than any similar trade agreement we've ever concluded. Most of our trade deficit in the world is with Japan, and 60 percent of our Japanese trade deficit is in autos and auto parts. We have a big surplus in auto parts in the rest of the world and a big deficit with them.

This agreement will allow us to improve our position, not to guarantee us results, but it will give us a chance to compete and to be treated fairly and to create American jobs. And coincidentally, it will be good for Japan, because their more closed economic system has led to the unbelievable anomaly of their being the richest country in the world on paper but not in fact, because their working people are paying 40 percent more—40 percent more—for basic consumer products than Americans are because their markets are closed. We lose jobs, they get money, but they can't do anything with it except spend more for the same stuff.

This is going to be a good thing for America. But it's going to be good for Japan, and it's going to be good for the world. And we were right to be firm and strong and go to the 11th hour, because this is one of the kind of difficult changes we're going to have to make if the world is going to be as it should in the next century.

This was also a good day for America because of the hookup of the Soviet—the Russian and the American space vehicles. Did you see that on television? And you saw them laughing and having a good time together and tumbling around in space. You know, it's amazing when you think about it, all that's happened, just from the last 5 or 6 years. That partnership with Russia that you saw in space today is also being mirrored on the ground.

In Russia today, the Vice President is over there working with the Prime Minister of Russia, Mr. Chernomyrdin. They have established an unprecedented partnership that has helped us to work to continue to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons, to reduce the threat of weapons being stolen or smuggled or nuclear material being smuggled out of Russia, to try to deal with the whole raft of problems that they have that will help our country, to work with them to build their democracy and their economy in the years ahead.

One of the things that I am proudest of is that during our administration, for the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there are no Russian missiles pointed at the people of the United States of America. So we're celebrating.

And I also want to talk a little about why we're here. When the mayor went through the record that unemployment's down and jobs are up, and we passed the crime bill, and we passed more trade legislation than anybody in the history of the country, and we've dealt with a lot of important issues, we have been able to play a constructive role for peace in the Middle East and Northern Ireland, lots of other important places in the world, you might ask yourself, if that all happened, well, why isn't everybody happy? What happened in the '94 elections? What's going to happen in the '96 elections? That's what I want to talk to you about tonight.

I want to talk to you about what I believe about this country and what I hope you believe about this country, and why we are having the debate that we are having in Washington, DC, today. The truth is that for most Americans this exciting new world toward which we are moving that has caught us all up is a mixed bag. It is confusing, and they are confused. And that's why politics seems confusing. And it's why sometimes our adversaries do very well, because they are great at giving simple answers to hard questions. They're usually wrong, but it sounds good. It sounds good.

But I want you to think about what the world looks like from the point of view of the average American family. Let's just take the changes that are going on. Look at the economy. Consider this: In the last 2½ years, we've had 6.7 million new jobs, a big drop in the unemployment rate; the African-American unemployment rate has gone below 10 percent for the first time in 20 years; we have the lowest combined rates of unemployment and inflation in 30 years—that's very, very impressive—we've had the biggest expansion of trade ever in a 2-year period; the deficit has been cut, using the 7-year term now favored by the congressional majority, by a trillion dollars over 7 years;

but the median income in the United States has dropped one percent.

Now, if anybody had ever told you that jobs would go up, trade would go up, productivity would go up, inflation would go down, and the person in the middle would actually have a one-percent decline in their income, you wouldn't have an increase in income, it doesn't seem to compute. What happened? How did that happen?

In the last 2 years, we've had more new businesses formed in '93 and '94 than in any 2-year period in American history; more new people have become millionaires in '93 and '94 than in any comparable period in American history. But more than half of the people of this country, 60 percent to be exact, are working a longer work week today than they were 10 years ago for the same or lower wages once you adjust for inflation. It doesn't figure.

What caused all this? It's good news and bad news. Part of it was the global economy. Part of it is the information and technology revolution, which means fewer people can do more work. Part of it was wrong-headed policies in our Government. But it's happening.

So I get letters all the time from people that say, I know that things are going well, but I don't feel more secure. I got a letter the other day from a guy that I went to grade school with, came from a very poor family, made himself an engineer, got a job with a Fortune 500 company. And now, after working there for 25 years was one of three 49- and 50-year-old engineers who was laid off and thinks he will never again find another job at remotely the same income or benefits. He's very excited for all these good things that are happening to the American economy. But how does he send his kids to college?

So, it's like a good news-bad news story. I'll give you another example: the technology revolution. Do you know what technology means in education? It means that a child in a poor mountain hamlet in the hills of the Arkansas Ozarks can get on the Internet and hook into a library in Australia to get direct information about volcanoes down there to do a research project. It's incredible. That's what it means.

It means that—the technology revolution means that all of you, if you have a computer, can hook into the White House and get all the facts on the budget. We were getting 50,000 people an hour for a few hours after we announced our new budget. It's incredible, what it means.

It means a lot of other things that all of you know, I'm sure. But let me tell you what it also means. It means that our children can get on the Internet, and now, without paying any money, can be exposed to hardcore porn. It also means that a person who's smart enough to work a computer, but is slightly deranged and paranoid, can hook into the right people and learn how to make a bomb just like the one that blew up the Federal building in Oklahoma City. It also means that clever radical groups in places like Japan can have little vials of sarin gas they can go into subway systems and break open and kill a lot of innocent people. It means that here in our own country we found radical groups experimenting with biological weapons, germ warfare. Technology: good news and bad news.

Foreign policy: the good news is, no Russian missiles pointed at the United States. The good news is the cold war is over, and there's no serious threat to our security. The bad news is that once you strip the veneer of Communist control off of Russia with nothing to replace it, within 5 years half the banks are run by organized crime.

Hillary and I went to the Baltic States, to Riga, Latvia, and had tens of thousands of people in the streets thanking us for helping to get the Russian troops out of there for the first time since before the Second World War, people weeping in the streets. We went inside to a meeting, and the first thing the President of the country asked us for was an FBI office, because now that there was no communism and no soldiers, they were worried that the port was going to become a center for drug traffickers.

The crime problem: every major city in the country that's taken an aggressive stance against crime sees the crime rate going down, and that's the good news. But there are so many young people in this country that don't have strong family situations, don't have good community situations, that the rate of ran-

dom violence among young teenagers is still going up. The rate of random drug use among young teenagers has started going up again, which means unless we figure out something to do about it, in 5 or 6 years, there's going to be an awful price to pay.

So there's all these wonderful things going on, and all these troubling things going on. Is it surprising that people would look at all this and be confused and frustrated and anxiety-ridden and feel somewhat insecure?

Now, let me tell you, I believe with all my heart that the United States is better positioned for the 21st century than any nation in the world. I believe that the good news—I believe that the good news outweighs the bad. And I believe that the future's going to be fine if we will face these challenges.

But I have spent a lot of time in the last few months thinking about how to explain this to my fellow citizens. I ran for President for two reasons. I wanted to restore the American dream, because I did not want my child to be part of the first generation of Americans to do worse than their parents, because I did not want to see all these young people in our cities and isolated rural areas growing up in poverty with nothing to look forward to, and I wanted to unite the country. I wanted to bring us together.

The diversity of America, the diversity of Chicago, the racial, religious, ethnic diversity we have in this country, unique among all the large countries of the world, is our meal ticket to the global economy if we can figure out what to do about it.

And if you ask me to give myself a grade on the first 2½ years, I would say I did a very good job on the first part of that, because we have really worked hard on the economy and on crime and on the other major issues we're facing. But now, as President, I have to work harder on the second part: How to bring the American people together; how we can understand what it is we are facing.

Because I can tell you right now in Washington—the Members of Congress who are here will tell you—we are debating fundamental questions that we thought were resolved 50, 60, 70 years ago now. All these changes in the economy and all these changes in the way we live and work have led to a sense of unsettling, and it led us to a composition in the Congress of people who literally are prepared to debate the first principles of our society. And you better be part of the debate if you want it to come out in the way you believe.

I now believe our ability to restore the American dream and to get this country going economically, to grow the middle class and shrink the under class, our ability to face all these other problems, depends upon our ability to have some understanding about how we relate to each other as a community and what this country's all about. And I just want to give you two or three examples of the profound debates going on in Washington today and why I come down where I do and why I hope you will understand how important this election is.

Debate number one in Washington: Are the problems we have as Americans primarily personal and cultural, or are they primarily political and economic? There are a whole lot of people in the Congress today who believe there's really nothing for the Government to do about our problems and nothing for them to do in their private capacity because most of our problems are personal and cultural. So if everybody would just wake up every day and do the right thing and stop misbehaving, and if people would stop putting out bad movies and CD's, we would have Nirvana. Everything would be fine. [*Laughter*]

Now, you're laughing, but I'm serious. I am serious. There are people who honestly believe that. And let us give them their due. At a certain level, it is true. That is, there is nothing I can do for you if you're not prepared to do the right thing yourself. You will all concede that. You didn't have enough money to come to this fundraiser tonight because somebody just gave you something. You had to live your life in a certain way. So at a certain level, that is true.

It is also true that the influence centers in our culture, whether it's entertainment or media or sports or you name it, have great influence in our society independent of politics and business and economics. That's also true.

But what bothers me is that if that's all you say about it, it's just an excuse to walk

away from our common problems, and pretend we're not one country. What I believe is that our problems are both personal and cultural and political and economic. And I don't intend to use the personal and cultural nature of our problems as an excuse to walk away from our common responsibilities to do better.

And I'll try to give you a simple example of every one. Example number one: the family and medical leave law. There were people who opposed the family and medical leave law. They said, it is wrong to impose any burden on the private sector at all. It will be terrible for them. And besides that, we are philosophically opposed to it.

I believe that, on the personal and cultural side, if every kid in this country had two parents taking care of her or him and loving them and giving them discipline and giving them direction, we'd have about a third of the problems we've got in this country today. Most of them would be gone. I believe that.

Now, I also believe that economically most people who are adults in this country have to work to make a living, whether they live alone or whether they're in a single-parent or a two-parent family. Therefore, the most important thing we can do, arguably, is to enable our fellow citizens to succeed as parents and to succeed as workers. Therefore, people ought to be able to take a little time off without losing their job if their child is sick or their parent is sick or a baby is born or something terrible happens to their family. So I supported that.

Now, that is the kind of fundamental debate we're having. You've got to decide where you stand. I say it's both, both personal and economic and political. And I hope you believe that. But a lot of people don't.

Let me give you another example. The mayor mentioned the crime bill. You know, I'm the only President—sort of, maybe this is not a compliment to me—but I'm the only sitting President, as opposed to somebody who gets out of office and does it, who has ever opposed the National Rifle Association in the Senate. [*Applause*]

Now, I want to—I hate to say what I'm about to say now that you clapped. [*Laughter*] The truth is that I have agreed with them on many things. When I was a Governor, I worked with the NRA a lot. I like their hunter education programs. I liked the fact that they tried to help me resolve some very difficult problems relating to people in rural areas and where you could hunt and where you couldn't and all of that. I don't oppose everything they want. What I oppose is this world view. This is not about the right to keep and bear arms, not the Brady bill and not the assault weapons ban.

There is one view that says, look, the crime problem is a personal problem. It is people doing wrong, right? Their slogan: "Guns don't kill people, people do," right? It's a personal problem. So find the wrongdoer, put him in jail, and throw the key away. This is politics, economics aside—has nothing to do with this. This is about personal wrongdoing. And therefore, don't you dare inconvenience me one bit because of something somebody else did. I shouldn't have to wait 5 days to get my handgun, because I haven't done anything wrong. If I want to carry a TEK–9 around, I haven't done anything wrong. And who are you to judge me if I want to take it to target practice? That's what this is about. I'm not doing—just find the people who are doing wrong, and punish them. This is all individual. The problem is, if you talk to the police officers of the country, if you talk to the prosecutors and the former prosecutors, like the mayor, they will tell you that this is like all of our other problems: If we will all take some responsibility for it, we can make progress.

So I have no objection, and I don't think anybody should, to saying to the citizens of this country, it is your responsibility to go through the minor inconvenience of waiting 5 days so we can keep people who have got no business buying guns from buying guns. It is a minor sacrifice for a major good. I don't have any problem telling those guys that you—it may break your heart not to have one of these TEK–9's, but it's worth it to get the Uzis out of the high schools. Sacrifice a little bit for a greater good.

I'll tell you—this may be an unpopular statement here—I agree with this decision the Supreme Court made saying that that school had the right to drug-test the kids who wanted to play on the sports teams. And I'll tell you why. Not because I think most kids

do drugs, they don't. Not because I think most of our kids are bad, they're not. They're good. But our young people are pretty smart, and they know this drug deal is a big problem in our country. And I think it's worth saying to them, ''It's a privilege to be on an athletic team. It's a privilege to be in music. It's a privilege to do extracurricular activities. This is something you ought to do for your country. Help us get rid of the scourge of drugs in our schools. Be willing to be tested as an example and to help us catch the people who are doing it. Don't cry about having your rights infringed, when all we're asking you to do is to band together and assume a little bit of responsibility and go through a little bit of inconvenience to move this country forward and help us deal with our problems.'' That's what we ought to be doing.

And I come now to the third example, the budget. Let's give the Republicans credit. First, they wanted to do the balanced budget amendment. And it failed by a vote because a lot of people thought it was a dodge and because a lot of people feared that sometime we might need to run a deficit in a recession, and we couldn't do it. But then they came up with a balanced budget. And it adds up, and it's a credible budget.

And I want you to know, I think they're entitled to credit for that. Why? Because I believe it's important to balance the budget. Now, I know a lot of people don't. But let me remind you, this country never—never—had a permanent, structural deficit before 1981. Never. We ran rather modest deficits all during the seventies, because those of you who were around then will remember that we had something called stagflation and the economy was weak, and we needed to do it for sound economic reasons. But we never had a permanent, huge deficit.

In 1981, we adopted those big tax cuts. We never really got over it. And then there was sort of a bipartisan agreement in Washington because the Democrats were not about to cut spending as much as it would take to balance the budget and the Republican Presidents didn't want to raise anybody's taxes, because it violated their ideology.

So I got to be President 2½ years ago with the debt quadrupled in 12 years. And I'll tell you how severe it is: Our budget would be balanced today but for the interest we have to pay on the debt run up in the 12 years before I became President. I'll tell you how severe it is: Next year, interest payments on the debt will exceed the defense budget. You want more money for the Chicago schools? You want me to help educate more kids? You want me to invest in your efforts to clean up the environment and grow the economy? We won't have it unless we do something to change our spending priorities. So it matters.

When we brought the deficit down 2 years ago, that's how we got the economy going again, because we drove interest rates down and we got this economy spurred. So it is important. But there's a right way and a wrong way to do it.

What is the difference between my budget and theirs? It rests on a simple philosophical difference. They believe—this is honest. I'm not being critical; I'm telling you what they honestly believe. In the heart—when you strip it all away, they believe that the purpose of the Government is national defense, tax cuts on capital, and balance the budget as quick as possible, because the Government would mess up a one-car parade. Otherwise, it's not good for anything. And we don't have any public responsibilities that should be manifest that way. That's what they believe. That's their honest conviction.

Now, I believe that the purpose of Government is to help people make the most of their own lives, that's what I believe, and to meet the challenges of the moment, and to provide security for people who have done what they're supposed to do. That's what I believe.

So our budget says, look, if you balance the budget in 10 years instead of 7, if you cut this tax cut by more than half and you don't give it to people who don't really need it and you focus the tax breaks on education and child rearing, the two most important jobs in our society, then you don't have to gut Medicare and Medicaid. You can shave them in a modest way without worrying about whether you're going to close urban hospitals or close rural hospitals or hurt elderly people who don't have enough money to live on as it is. And not only that, you don't have to cut education at all. You can

increase education. You can increase Head Start. You can increase apprenticeships for kids that don't go to college. You can increase student loans. You can increase our investment in technology and research. That is the difference.

My belief is we should balance the budget, but we should also grow the economy. The purpose of balancing the budget is to raise incomes, to create jobs, to bring us closer together, to enable us to meet our challenges. So I think my budget is better. But it all rests on a philosophical difference. You have to decide which side of the divide you're on.

I believe our Government's purpose is to help people make the most of their own lives. And let me just point out, there's a lot of people in that Congress who are there because we did that. The GI bill after World War II built the greatest middle class in the history of the world because the Government tried to help people make the most of their own lives. And that's the kind of thing we ought to be doing now.

So our budget proposes a GI bill for America's workers. It proposes the kind of thing that they ought to be for, collapsing all the separate training programs of the Government, putting it in a big voucher. If you lose your job, you call the Government, say, "I'm enrolling at the local community college." We send $2,600 a year for 2 years and let people get a re-education or retraining program to get a new job and a better income and a new start in life. That's the kind of thing I think is worth spending money on. You have to decide where you stand on that.

These are the big, fundamental issues we're debating in Washington today. I believe time is on our side now. And I believe it for a couple of reasons. First of all, as hideous and awful and heartbreaking as the bomb in Oklahoma City was, it took a lot of the meanness out of this country. It brought us together. It made us all think about the impact of our words and our feelings and how we've been conducting ourselves.

And then when Captain O'Grady survived that magnificent, terrible 6 days in Bosnia and he was rescued, it put a little zip back in our step and made us realize what was best about this country. And I think our heads are kind of getting on straighter today as a people.

But I want you to know, I'm going to spend the next year determined to continue to move the country forward economically, to continue to deal with all these problems we've talked about. But we've got to get ourselves together.

I am telling you, this is a great country. If we can get ourselves together, if we can understand we have certain common responsibilities, if we can understand it is a phony political debate to try to say problems are personal and cultural as opposed to political and economic when they are both, if we can have a conversation with each other again about what it's really going to take to help people make the most of their own lives and give every American a chance to succeed, then we are going to do just fine. That is what the 1996 elections are all about.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 8:46 p.m. in the International Ballroom at the Chicago Hilton and Towers. In his remarks, he referred to Mayor Richard M. Daley of Chicago; former Special Counselor to the President for NAFTA William Daley; Rev. Jack Wall, pastor, Old St. Patrick's Church; Debra DeLee, chair, Democratic National Convention; and David Wilhelm, former chairman, Democratic National Committee. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Letter to the Speaker of the House on Emergency Salvage Timber Sale Legislation

June 29, 1995

Dear Mr. Speaker:

I am pleased to be able to address myself to the question of the Emergency Salvage Timber Sale Program in H.R. 1944. I want to make it clear that my Administration will carry out this program with its full resources and a strong commitment to achieving the goals of the program.

I do appreciate the changes that the Congress has made to provide the Administration with the flexibility and authority to carry this program out in a manner that conforms to our existing environmental laws and standards. These changes are also important to

preserve our ability to implement the current forest plans and their standards and to protect other natural resources.

The agencies responsible for this program will, under my direction, carry the program out to achieve the timber sales volume goals in the legislation to the fullest possible extent. The financial resources to do that are already available through the timber salvage sale fund.

I would hope that by working together we could achieve a full array of forest health, timber salvage and environmental objectives appropriate for such a program.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: This letter was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary on June 30, but was not issued as a White House press release.

Remarks on Receiving the Abraham Lincoln Courage Award in Chicago

June 30, 1995

Thank you so much, Mike Robbins. Thank you for your presentation. Thank you much more for your courage and for your willingness to come back to work after being wounded 11 times. A lot of Americans wouldn't do that, and we appreciate you for doing it.

We thank you, Officer Jackson, Officer Bubalo. We thank the representatives of the Fraternal Order of Police who are here from Chicago and the State of Illinois, Bill Nolan and Sgt. Keith Turney. Thank you, Commander O'Shield. I hope you don't decide to run for President anytime soon after that reception you got when you were introduced—[*laughter*]—or mayor or anything else. [*Laughter*]

I want to thank Mark Karlin for what he said and for his long and often lonely battle against handgun violence.

The First Lady and I are delighted to be here with you today. I do want to introduce just one person of the many who came with me today because he carries on our part of the bargain fighting for law enforcement and against violence in Washington, Under Secretary of the Treasury Ron Noble, who is back here with me. Ron, stand up. Thank you very much.

I thank Superintendent Rodriguez for his outstanding leadership. Senator, thank you for what you said and for what you have done. To all the other distinguished officials who are here, I thank you. I want to say a special word of thanks to the mayor for his leadership and for his willingness to roll up his sleeves and actually solve problems.

You know, I like listening to the mayor talk because he never tries to be flowery, he just says what he has to say. [*Laughter*] But when he gets finished talking, you don't have any doubt about what he just said. [*Laughter*] And I like it because he's interested in doing things and giving other people the power to do things and bringing people together. That means a lot to me. We need more in Washington of what you have here in Chicago and in this Austin neighborhood.

I thank the other dignitaries who are here. Congressman, Bishop, thank you for coming. And ladies and gentlemen, I want to say a special word of thanks to some young people who are here from the "I Have A Dream" Program and the AmeriCorps volunteers who are working with them. Where are they? They're over there.

The "I Have A Dream" Program was founded in New York by a friend of Hillary's and mine named Eugene Lange, who believed that if you would reach young people in grade school and tell them that if they'd stay in school and stay off drugs and make their grades, you'd guarantee them that they could go all the way through college. That's what the "I Have A Dream" Program is about. And those kids in this neighborhood are part of that, and our national service program is helping. And I'm proud of them.

Ladies and gentlemen, it's already been said by Officer Robbins and others, but really this award ought to be given today to the officer who was killed here just a few months ago, Daniel Doffyn, and to his partner, and to Mike Robbins and his partner, and to all those who are willing to put their lives upon the line.

You heard the superintendent say it a moment ago, but Officer Doffyn and his partner, Officer Bubalo, were standing just where we stand today, getting ready to go

to work, when they heard a call on the radio that said men were breaking into an apartment building just across the street. They were rookie officers who answered the call. They found gang members from another neighborhood who had come to disrupt this neighborhood. They were stopping one of the suspects when another came upon them. He murdered Officer Doffyn. He critically wounded his partner. He did it with a TEK–9 semiautomatic, one of the weapons banned in the 1994 crime bill.

Officer Doffyn was like me in one important respect, the most important of all. He had a daughter, an 8-year-old daughter who now will have to live with the memory of her father and his sacrifice.

When we talk about these issues and the decisions we ought to make on them, we're a long way, in Washington, DC, from the streets of Austin neighborhood. We'd be a lot better off if we had to vote on issues in front of the place where the police officer was killed.

I know that even from the worst tragedies, some good can spring. After the awful, awful bombing in Oklahoma City a lot of the meanness went out of America, and we all began to ask ourselves again, what can we do to do a better job for our country? What can we do to reach across the lines that are dividing us? What can we do to minimize the hatred and extremism in our own country?

I'm told that after Officer Doffyn was killed, children from Howe Elementary School across the street came to the police station to make sure their favorite police officers were safe, and that some of the officers took the children home in squad cars to reassure them and make sure they were okay. Now, outside this neighborhood that might surprise some people, but I've learned enough from the mayor and others about what you're doing here to know that you've been working for a long time to build that kind of community. Your mission statement—I wish every neighborhood in America had a mission statement—your mission statement says you want to make your neighborhood safe, prosperous, secure, productive, and proud. That's what I want for America.

In this neighborhood the words ''community'' and ''policing'' mean the same thing because the men and women of the 15th are the community and they understand that the best way to lower the crime rate is to prevent crime, to stop it from happening in the first place. They are working with you to set up a drug court to help people who get in trouble find a way to get out of trouble and go on to productive lives, not just go to prison. They are working with you to reach out to your children, to help them stay off drugs and stay out of gangs. They are watching out for you as you watch out for one another.

So many of you have taken responsibility for this neighborhood and your lives, and you are getting results. Crime is down across the board. I drove through these streets today and I saw homes, schools, businesses, churches, police stations, all doing their part to keep you safe and pull you together.

Despite the sadness that we all feel today, you should all be very proud. And you should be committed to keeping this community strong and to saving the lives and futures of these children.

When I ran for President, I promised that I would do everything I could to help you in this effort. Part of it was trying to restore the economy and bring opportunities to places that had been too long denied them, which is why I worked with the mayor and others to put an empowerment zone in Chicago, to try to prove that we could bring jobs and incomes and a future to people. But a big part of it was just trying to restore a simple sense of security to people who work hard and obey the law and are doing the best with their own lives.

The mayor referred to this, and Senator Simon knows it well because he was there for the whole time, but the Congress actually debated a crime bill for 6 years without doing anything about it, because there was always some political objection on the right or the left for getting together and doing something that would make a lot of sense at the grassroots level a long way from Washington. Well, we passed the crime bill, and it was largely written by the police officers of America. And it had a requirement that we put 100,000 more police on the street, a 20 percent increase of people walking the beat,

working in the neighborhoods, helping to prevent crime in the first place.

I can tell you, that bill just passed late last year, but we are already—we already have given law enforcement agencies in this country enough grants to hire more than 20,000 new police. We're moving ahead of schedule to do that.

The second thing we did was to try and give law enforcement and community officials the tools they need to help save kids, to give children something to say yes to as well as something to say no to. The law enforcement people in this country knew that we needed tougher punishment, we needed greater protection. We passed the "three strikes and you're out" law. We passed the law strengthening the death penalty provisions, especially for people who kill law enforcement officers in the line of duty. But we also did what the law enforcement officers told us to do, which is to give them and community activists the tools to reach children early, to get them on the right path in life, to give them schools and jobs and opportunities and a future.

And yes, we took on the gun issue. And I want to say a little more about that in a minute, but it's been mentioned already. We passed the Brady law, which requires people to wait 5 days while we check the criminal and mental health histories of people who want to buy handguns, unless there is a computerized instant record check in place in a State. And we did ban 19 kinds of assault weapons and any identical copycats that might be made of them, for the obvious reasons you know.

I'll never forget—Mayor, you probably remember this—but we came here in 1994, and we sat at a panel in which people from your health care institutions told us that the mortality rate from gunshot wounds was dramatically increasing because the average victim had more bullets in his body when they showed up at the hospital. Why? Because of these assault weapons. I learned that in a hearing in Chicago from people who make a living working in emergency rooms, seeing people like Officers Robbins and Jackson every day. So yes, we did that.

And as we remember Officer Doffyn, I say there is at least one more thing we must do. Today I am announcing support for legislation that will ban armor-piercing bullets of all kinds.

Senator Simon referred to what we are trying to keep—and he's right, we do ban some kinds of armor-piercing bullets, thanks to him and others. But you need to know the law is written, in my opinion, in the wrong way. Today the law is written to ban ammunition based on what it's made of. If it contains certain materials, then it's off the street. Now, that's a good thing, but it's not good enough because clever people have figured out how to design ammunition made from common materials that do just as much damage. This legislation will change that. It will see to it that we judge ammunition not based on what it's made of but based on how much harm it can do. That should be the test. And the test should be simple and straightforward. If a bullet can rip through a bulletproof vest like a knife through hot butter, then it ought to be history. We should ban it.

Many Members of the United States Congress, Senator Moynihan, Senator Biden, Bradley, Cole, Congressman Schumer from New York, have joined Senator Simon and others for a long time in trying to deal with these issues. Now, I know this will be controversial among some, just like the Brady bill was, just like the assault weapons ban was. But I want to tell you something, folks. There's a reason that I decided that I should be the first President ever to take on these issues while in office rather than later. [*Laughter*] And I say that—I'm grateful for the support we've received from former Presidents. I'm grateful that Ronald Reagan stood up for the Brady bill and Jim Brady. I am grateful that President Bush resigned from the NRA when they called Federal officials "jackbooted thugs." We should applaud them. [*Applause*] We should applaud them.

But I want you to know the reason I decided to do it, apart from just—first of all, I was sick and tired of reading stories about young children in tough neighborhoods who were straight-A students, being gunned down standing by a bus stop. I got tired of reading that. You know, I got tired of reading all these high school kids and junior high school kids thinking about what kind of funerals

they were going to have because they knew so many kids that had been shot. I got tired of reading about it.

But there's another reason. I come from a place where more than half the people live in towns of 10,000 or less, where more than half the people have never been to a city as big as Chicago, and more than half the people have a hunting or a fishing license or both. When I was—long before I was a teenager, I had fired a .22 at cans and birds in bird season. I grew up thinking of guns as a part of my culture and not something evil or bad that would ever be used to kill people.

I understand the kind of folks who have formed the basis of a lot of the opposition to this gun legislation because they never see what you live with every day. They literally don't experience it. So I understood that. But you know, what my position is, is very different. I don't think this is—I don't think the Brady bill or the assault weapons ban or the cop-killer bullet legislation is about the right to keep and bear arms. I think it's about whether we as Americans are willing, those of us who are law-abiding, to undergo some minor inconveniences so we can solve our problems together and keep our kids alive and have a safer future and be fair to our police officers. That's what this is about.

And it's interesting, you know, most of the people who oppose the Brady bill and oppose the assault weapons ban, they don't mind walking through an airport metal detector. But I'm old enough to remember when those metal detectors were first put in when you walk through an airport. Now, we don't think about it today, do we? Even though most of us would never consider carrying a gun on an airplane, much less a bomb, we go through the metal detectors, and we don't think anything about it. Why? Because it is a minor sacrifice to get on a safe airplane.

There was a decision made by the Supreme Court the other day that's somewhat controversial, but I support it. I want to tell you about it because it's the same point. The Supreme Court said it was all right for a school district to require young people who wanted to be on the football team to undergo drug testing, not because we think most kids are bad—they're not—not because most of them are using drugs—they're not—but because drugs are tearing the heart out of the children of America. It is a privilege to play on a sports team or be in the school band or do anything else like that, and it is a minor inconvenience for young people to take a stand to help to get drugs out of our schools.

Now, that's what I think about this. So I say to all the people who own guns and don't feel like they're ever going to do anything wrong and just want us to punish criminals, it is no big deal if you have to wait a few days to get the next handgun. You will survive. And it's a good thing.

And I say to all the people who love to hunt and shoot in shooting contests, you will be able to do it, and you will find a way to do it even without the TEK–9's. It's worth it to get the Uzis out of the high schools and off the streets, and the bullets out of the bodies of these police officers we celebrate today. It is worth it. It is worth it.

Nobody is interfering with your right to hunt or to enter into any kind of sporting contest or to do whatever else you want to do. But this is a minor, minor change that's good for all of us. And sooner or later, those of us who live in disparate areas of the country with different experiences have got to realize we have common obligations to the common good. And everybody in the smallest rural hamlet in my State is going to be better off if kids don't get killed on the streets of Chicago and police officers don't get gunned down because we got rid of assault weapons and we got rid of cop-killer bullets. We're going to be better off if that happens.

And you know, let me just say one other thing to everybody who objects to this today. I'm almost 50 years old. I have never seen a deer, a duck, or a wild turkey wearing a Kevlar vest in my life. You do not need—[*laughter*]—you do not need these bullets.

So I ask you all to support this. I ask you to oppose the efforts of the lobbies in Washington to lift the ban on assault weapons. I ask you to oppose their efforts to roll back the crime bill; oppose their efforts to keep us from getting all these horrible police-killing bullets out of our lives; and, as Senator Simon said, oppose their efforts to indiscriminately say all felons can have their guns back.

We live in the freest nation the world has ever known, because over 219 years we have found ways to agree on discipline, restraint, and order, to preserve our liberty. And all, all systems of discipline, restraint, and order affect the law-abiding and the lawless equally. That is the point.

So I ask you all today to remember that. I accept this award today, even though I don't feel like I deserve it, because I just did my duty. And I knew because of my childhood and the life I live and the State I governed what the issues were, what the stakes were, and what the forces in play were in this battle over the Brady bill, the assault weapons ban, and the cop-killer bullet issue.

Most of the people on the other side of this issue are good people. But they don't have your experience. And it is time for them to think about you. It is time for them to make minor concessions so that you can have major advances in safety, in security, in the future of your children, in the security of your police officers, in the Austin neighborhood, in Chicago, Illinois, and throughout the United States of America. It is time for us to pull together on this issue and do the right thing.

Abraham Lincoln, who saved our Republic, said something very important in his first inaugural. When the country was coming apart at the seams over the issue of slavery and we were headed smack-dab into a Civil War, and when half the people in the country hated him and he'd been elected President with only 39 percent of the vote, he had the understanding to say, "We are not enemies, but friends. We must not be enemies."

So I say to you today, my friends: Let us stand up for the future of our children. Let us stand up for the security of our police forces and their ability to work with us. And let us say to those who disagree, we ask you for a minor contribution to a major public good. Let us not be enemies but friends.

Thank you, and God bless you all.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:05 a.m. at the 15th District Police Headquarters. In his remarks, he referred to Mike Robbins, Talmadge Jackson, and Milan Bubalo, Chicago police officers wounded in the line of duty; Bill Nolan, president, Chicago Fraternal Order of Police; Sgt. Keith Turney, chairman of the trustees, Illinois State Fraternal Order of Police; Leroy O'Shield, commander, 15th District, Chicago Police Dept.; Mark Karlin, president, Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence, which sponsored the award; Matt Rodriguez, Chicago Superintendent of Police; and Bishop Shepard Little, Church of God in Christ.

Message to the Congress Transmitting the "Saving Law Enforcement Officers' Lives Act of 1995"

June 30, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

Today I am transmitting for your immediate consideration and passage the "Saving Law Enforcement Officers' Lives Act of 1995." This Act would limit the manufacture, importation, and distribution of handgun ammunition that serves little sporting purpose, but which kills law enforcement officers. The details of this proposal are described in the enclosed section-by-section analysis.

Existing law already provides for limits on ammunition based on the specific materials from which it is made. It does not, however, address the problem of excessively powerful ammunition based on its performance.

Criminals should not have access to handgun ammunition that will pierce the bullet-proof vests worn by law enforcement officers. That is the standard by which so-called "cop-killer" bullets are judged. My proposal would limit the availability of this ammunition.

The process of designating such ammunition should be a careful one and should be undertaken in close consultation with all those who are affected, including representatives of law enforcement, sporting groups, the industries that manufacture bullet-proof vests and ammunition, and the academic research community. For that reason, the legislation requires the Secretary of the Treasury to consult with the appropriate groups before regulations are promulgated. The legislation also provides for congressional review of the proposed regulations before they take effect.

This legislation will save the lives of law enforcement officers without affecting the needs of legitimate sporting enthusiasts. I

urge its prompt and favorable consideration by the Congress.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 30, 1995.

Statement on the Nomination of General John M. Shalikashvili To Be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff

June 30, 1995

I am pleased to announce that I have nominated General John M. Shalikashvili, U.S. Army, for reappointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for a 2-year term.

As I said when I nominated General Shalikashvili for Chairman in 1993, he is a shining symbol of what is best about the United States and best about our armed services. He has again proven that over the past 20 months by maintaining the strongest military in the world, with the equipment and trained force to fight and win when we must, even as he completed the post-cold-war drawdown of our forces. From morale to readiness, General Shalikashvili has provided the sound leadership needed to keep our military strong while shaping the Armed Forces for the 21st century. I look forward to the next 2 years with General Shalikashvili as Chairman, to his wise and reasoned counsel, and to his advocacy for the men and women in the Armed Forces in support of the national security of the United States.

Message to the Congress on Most-Favored-Nation Trade Status for Russia

June 30, 1995

To the Congress of the United States:

On September 21, 1994, I determined and reported to the Congress that the Russian Federation is in full compliance with the freedom of emigration criteria of sections 402 and 409 of the Trade Act of 1974. This action allowed for the continuation of most-favored-nation (MFN) status for Russia and certain other activities without the requirement of a waiver.

As required by law, I am submitting an updated Report to Congress concerning the emigration laws and policies of the Russian Federation. You will find that the report indicates continued Russian compliance with U.S. and international standards in the area of emigration.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
June 30, 1995.

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.

June 20 [1]

The President announced his intention to nominate William H. Itoh as Ambassador to Thailand.

June 24

In the morning, the President went from Little Rock, AR, to Pine Bluff, AR, where he met with community leaders in the Banquet Hall at the Pine Bluff Convention Center. He returned to Little Rock in the late afternoon.

June 25

In the afternoon, the President traveled to San Francisco, CA.

June 26

In the afternoon, the President met with President Lech Walesa of Poland in the Foyer at Herbst Theater.

In the evening, the President attended a dinner hosted by Walter Shorenstein at his residence. Following the dinner, he traveled to Portland, OR.

The President announced his intention to nominate Eluid Levi Martinez as Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation at the Department of the Interior.

[1] This item was not received in time for inclusion in the appropriate issue.

The President announced his intention to appoint Richard L. Bloch and Stanley S. Shuman to the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board.

The President declared a major disaster in the State of Oklahoma and ordered Federal aid to supplement State and local recovery efforts in the area struck by severe storms, flooding, and tornadoes beginning May 26.

June 27

In the evening, the President returned to Washington, DC.

The President announced his intention to nominate George D. Milidrag to serve as a member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

June 28

The President announced his intention to nominate the following individuals to the following ambassadorial posts:

—Thomas W. Simons, Jr., Ambassador to Pakistan;

—John M. Yates, Ambassador to Benin;

—Frances D. Cook, Ambassador to Oman;

—J. Stapleton Roy, Ambassador to Indonesia.

The President announced that he has designated Joseph Stiglitz as Chair and that he intends to nominate Alicia Munnell as a member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers.

June 29

In the afternoon, the President attended a memorial service for former Supreme Court Chief Justice Warren E. Burger at the National Presbyterian Church.

In the late afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Chicago, IL.

The President announced his intention to nominate Stanley A. Riveles for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as U.S. Commissioner to the Standing Consultative Commission.

The President announced his intention to nominate William Harrison Courtney as Ambassador to the Republic of Georgia.

June 30

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton attended the annual luncheon of the American Association of Physicians from India at the Sheraton Chicago. They then traveled to Miami, FL.

The President announced his intention to nominate Howard M. Schloss to be Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs at the Department of the Treasury.

The President announced his intention to nominate John W. Douglass to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition.

The President announced his intention to appoint Arva Moore Parks to the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Nominations Submitted to the Senate

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

Submitted June 26

Derrick L. Forrister,
of Tennessee, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Congressional and Intergovernmental Affairs), vice William J. Taylor III, resigned.

Submitted June 27

Todd J. Campbell,
of Tennessee, to be U.S. District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, vice Thomas A. Wiseman, Jr., retired.

James M. Moody,
of Arkansas, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas, vice Henry Woods, retired.

Alberto J. Mora,
of Florida, to be a member of the Broadcasting Board of Governors for a term of 2 years (new position).

Evan J. Wallach,
of Nevada, to be a Judge of the U.S. Court of International Trade, vice Edward D. Re, retired.

Submitted June 28

George D. Milidrag,
of Michigan, to be a member of the Advisory Board of the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, vice L. Steven Reimers.

Lawrence H. Summers,
of Massachusetts, to be Deputy Secretary of the Treasury, vice Frank N. Newman, resigned.

Frances D. Cook,
of Florida, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Sultanate of Oman.

J. Stapleton Roy,
of Pennsylvania, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Indonesia.

Thomas W. Simons, Jr.,
of the District of Columbia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

John M. Yates,
of Washington, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Benin.

Submitted June 29

R. Guy Cole, Jr.,
of Ohio, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, vice Nathaniel R. Jones, retired.

John Raymond Garamendi,
of California, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior, vice Frank A. Bracken, resigned.

Submitted June 30

Ernest W. DuBester,
of New Jersey, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for a term expiring July 1, 1998 (reappointment).

Richard Henry Jones,
of Nebraska, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

William Harrison Courtney,
of West Virginia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Georgia.

Barry Ted Moskowitz,
of California, to be U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of California (new position).

Stephen M. Orlofsky,
of New Jersey, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of New Jersey, vice Dickinson Richards Debevoise, retired.

Donald C. Pogue,
of Connecticut, to be a Judge of the U.S. Court of International Trade, vice James L. Watson, retired.

Howard Monroe Schloss,
of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, vice Joan Logue-Kinder.

William K. Sessions III,
of Vermont, to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Vermont, vice Fred I. Parker, elevated.

Ortrie D. Smith,
of Missouri, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Missouri, vice Howard F. Sachs, retired.

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 June 25

Transcript of a press briefing by National Security Adviser Anthony Lake on the Haitian elections

Released June 26

Transcript of remarks by the First Lady at a PBS event

Transcript of remarks by the First Lady at an American newswomen press conference

Released June 27

Announcement of nomination for U.S. District Court and U.S. Court of International Trade judges

Released June 28

Transcript of a press briefing by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on the President's appointment of the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry announcing the President's letter to congressional leaders on the plan to balance the budget

Transcript of a press briefing by Special Associate Counsel to the President Mark Fabiani on Webster Hubbell

Released June 29

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Mike McCurry

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on the President's meeting with Syrian Chief of Staff Lt. Gen. Hikmat al-Shihabi and Israeli Chief of Staff Lt. Gen. Amnon Shahak

Announcement of nomination for a U.S. Court of Appeals judge for the Sixth Circuit

Released June 30

Statement by Press Secretary Mike McCurry on lifting of trade sanctions against Taiwan and major steps towards protection of endangered species

Announcement of nomination for four U.S. District Court and U.S. Court of International Trade judges

Statement by Chief of Staff Leon Panetta on rescission legislation

Fact sheet on the "Saving Law Enforcement Officers' Lives Act of 1995"

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.